Published on the 15th of the month.

Vol. XII., No. 9. DECEMBER, 1922.

THE MODERN CHURCHMAN

A monthly Magazine to maintain the cause of
TRUTH, FREEDOM, and COMPREHENSIVENESS
in the Anglican Communion.

EDITOR: H. D. A. MAJOR, B.D.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
If and Peradventure. The Editor	481
A Century of Anglican Theology. C. C. J. Webb, M.A., Hon. LL.D.	486
The Prophetic Ministry of the New Reformation. R. Meiklejohn, B.D., LL.B.	498
The Advent Hope	504
English Poetry and the War. H. G. Mulliner, B.A.	511
Book Notices:—	
Genesis and the Chinese	519
Early Christianity	520
The Gospel of the Manhood	521
An Ambiguous Manifesto	523
A Much-Needed Book	524
Wholesome Words	525
Correspondence:—	
The Lord of Thought	526
The Other Side of Hinduism	526
The Church in the West Indies	527
Unity in China	529
The Brahmo-Somaj and Christianity	530
Dr. Harris's 'Creeds or no Creeds'	531
A Book for Parents and Teachers	533
A Revised Canon of the Scriptures	533
The Virgin-Birth	534
Emigrants and Honorary Clergy	535

OXFORD: BASIL BLACKWELL, 49 BROAD STREET

AGENTS: SOUTH AFRICA—T. MASKEW MILLER, Cape Town.
AUSTRALIA—A. McCUBBIN & Co., 152 Elizabeth Street, Melbourne.
NEW ZEALAND—WALTER NASH, 110–112 Lambton Quay, Wellington.

Price 1/- net. Annual Subscription, 10/6.

THE MODERN CHURCHMAN

All literary contributions and books for review should be addressed to:—The Rev. H. D. A. MAJOR, B.D., Ripon Hall, Oxford.

All advertisements and orders should be addressed to:—BASIL BLACKWELL, Office of *The Modern Churchman*, 49 Broad Street, Oxford.

THE CHURCHMEN'S UNION

FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF LIBERAL RELIGIOUS THOUGHT

Inaugurated at the Church House, Westminster, October 31st, 1898.

President—Professor PERCY GARDNER, Litt.D., LL.D., F.S.A., F.B.A., Oxford.

Vice-Presidents:

PHILIP H. BAGENAL, O.B.E.
Rt. Rev. Bishop A. HAMILTON BAYNES.
F. C. CHANNING, Esq.
The ARCHDEACON OF WESTMINSTER, F.B.A.
The Rev. Canon CREMER, M.A.
The DEAN OF CARLISLE, F.B.A.
The Rev. HUBERT HANDLEY, M.A.
The Rev. GEORGE HENSLOW, M.A.
Sir LAWRENCE JONES, Bart., M.A.
The Rev. Prof. KIRSOPP LAKE, D.D.
The Rev. W. D. MORRISON, LL.D.
The Rev. Canon PAPILLON, M.A.
The DEAN OF PETERBOROUGH.
The Rev. Canon H. P. PLUMPTRE, M.A.
J. ST. LOE STRACHEY, Esq.

Members of the Council, 1921-22.

Chairman—Canon GLAZEBROOK, D.D.

Professor Sir W. ASHLEY, Ph.D.
Mr. P. H. BAGENAL, O.B.E.
Sir JOHN BARRAN, Bart., M.P.
Rev. C. BASS, M.A.
Rev. J. WORSLEY BODEN, M.A.
Rt. Rev. Bishop A. HAMILTON BAYNES.
Prebendary CALDECOTT, D.Litt., D.D.
Rev. A. J. CARLYLE, D.Litt.
Rev. J. R. COHU, M.A.
Hon. GILBERT COLERIDGE.
Rev. C. W. EMMET, B.D.
Rev. ALFRED FAWKES, M.A.
Rev. Canon GAMBLE, B.D.
Rev. F. G. GIVEN-WILSON, M.A.
Rev. J. C. HARDWICK, M.A.
The Very Rev. W. R. INGE, C.V.O., D.D.
The MASTER OF JESUS COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE.
Rev. Dr. STEWART MACGOWAN, LL.D.
Rev. H. D. A. MAJOR, B.D.
Mrs. MICHELMORE.
Rev. W. D. MORRISON, LL.D.
Mr. CLAUD MULLINS.
Miss NUSSEY.
Rev. C. RAVEN, B.D.
The Very Rev. HASTINGS RASHDALL, D.Litt., [F.B.A.
Rev. G. RENDALL, D.Litt., LL.D.
Mrs. REITH.
Miss MAUDE ROYDEN.
Rev. C. F. RUSSELL, M.A.
Rev. E. ST. G. SCHOMBERG, M.A.
Rev. C. J. SHARP, M.A.
Rev. C. J. SHEBBEARE, B.D.
Rev. H. R. L. SHEPPARD, M.A.
Mr. NOWELL SMITH, M.A.
Canon TOLLINTON, M.A., D.D.
Mr. H. F. WALKER.

Offices—10 CLIFFORD STREET, BOND STREET, W.1.
Hon. Secretary and Treasurer—PHILIP H. BAGENAL, O.B.E.
Assistant Hon. Secretary—Miss DOWELL.
Hon. Auditor—Mr. ROBERT WARNER, F.C.A., 14 Priory Road, Kilburn, N.W.6.
Hon. Librarian—Rev. W. M. PRYKE, B.D., St. Aidan's Vicarage, South Shields.
Hon. Secretary to the Annual Conference—Miss D. NUSSEY, Westfield, Ilkley.
Bankers—LONDON JOINT CITY AND MIDLAND BANK, 129 New Bond Street, W.1.

AIMS OF THE CHURCHMEN'S UNION.

1.—To affirm the continuous and progressive character of the revelation given by the Holy Spirit in the spheres of knowledge and of conduct.
2.—To maintain the right and duty of the Church of England to restate her doctrines from time to time in accordance with this revelation.
3.—To uphold the historic comprehensiveness of the Church of England.
4.—To defend the freedom of responsible students, clerical as well as lay, in their work of criticism and research.
5.—To promote the adaptation of the Church services to the needs and knowledge of the time.
6.—To assert the claim of the laity to a larger share in the government and responsible work of the Church.
7.—To foster co-operation and fellowship between the Church of England and other Christian Churches.
8.—To study the application of Christian principles and ideals to the whole of our social life.

Annual Subscription.—Members, at least 10/-; Associates, 1/-; Life Membership, £10.
Cheques should be made payable to the Hon. Secretary of the Churchmen's Union.
All communications as to membership, subscriptions, changes of address, and business matters should be sent to—

The Hon. Secretary, Churchmen's Union, 10 Clifford Street, Bond Street, W.1.

The Modern Churchman is sent **free** to all full members of the Churchmen's Union.

THE

MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus.*

A State without the means of change is without the means of its conservation.—*Edmund Burke.*

No. 9. DECEMBER, 1922. Vol. XII.

IF AND PERADVENTURE

By the Editor.

TWO recent novels, one of which in nine months has run through twenty-three editions, raise issues with which Modernists are concerned.

In *If Winter Comes* we hear the hero of the tale—and he is a real hero—Mark Sabre, saying:

> 'All are looking for something. You can see it in half the faces you see. Some wanting, and knowing they are wanting something. Others wanting something, but just putting up with it, just content to be discontented. You can see it. Yes, you can. Looking for what? Love? But lots have love. Happiness? But aren't lots happy? But are they?
>
> 'It goes deeper than that. It's some universal thing that's wanting. I think it's something that religion ought to give, but doesn't. Light? Some new light to give everyone certainty in religion, in belief. Light?' (p. 84).

And again:

> 'I said to him, "What's the remedy, Sabre?" He said to me, "Hapgood, the remedy's the old remedy. The old God. But it's more than that. It's Light: more Light. The old revelation was good for the old world, and suited to the old world, and told in themes of the old world's understanding. Mystical for ages steeped in the mystical; poetic for minds receptive of nothing beyond story and allegory and parable. We want a new revelation in terms of the new world's understanding. We want light, light! Do you suppose a man who lives on meat is going to find sustenance in bread and milk? Do you suppose an age that knows wireless and can fly is going to find spiritual sustenance in the food of an age that thought thunder was God speaking? Man's done with it. It mean's nothing to him. He turns all that's in him to get all he wants out of this world and let the next go hang . . . But I tell you, Hapgood, that plumb down in the crypt and abyss of every man's soul is a hunger, a craving for other food than this earthly stuff. And the churches know it, and instead of reaching down to him what he wants—light, light—instead of that, they invite him to dancing and picture shows,

and you're a jolly good fellow . . . Why, man, he can get all that outside the churches and get it better. Light, light! He wants light, Hapgood. And the padres come down and drink beer with him, and watch boxing matches with him, and sing music-hall songs with him, and dance and jazz with him, and call it making Religion a Living Thing in the Lives of the People. Lift the hearts of the people to God, they say, by shewing them that religion is not incompatible with having a jolly fine time. *And there's no God there that a man can understand for him to be lifted to.* . . . A man would not care *what* he had to give up if he knew he was making for something inestimably precious. But he doesn't know. Light, light . . . that's what he wants; and the longer it's withheld the lower he'll sink. Light! Light!' (pp. 255-6).

The meaning of this is clear enough. Mark Sabre feels deep down the need of religion, and he also feels the incredibility and the impossibility of religion as presented to him in the traditional form. The fact that the padres sugar their pill with the sweets of popular amusements and popular manners does not make it any more palatable or possible for him to swallow it. He feels the need of religion, but he insists on reality in religion. The old religion must somehow be brought up-to-date. *Light* and *certainty* are what he demands.

We turn now to the other novel—*Peradventure*, by Robert Keable. This book has been compared to Mrs. Humphry Ward's *Robert Elsmere*. It is slighter, but it has need to be. The twentieth century novel reader is intellectually and morally lighter than the nineteenth.

Its hero, Paul Kestern—a religious, emotional, young man—passes through a series of religious phases. He begins by being an enthusiastic, whole-hearted Evangelical. Next he becomes an ardent Anglo-Catholic, and very nearly enters the Roman Church. He pursues his spiritual pilgrimage, and when the story ends he has discarded institutional Christianity—its dogmatic system and its conventional ethical standards have ceased to have any authority for him. His last Gospel seems not to be the Gospel of the Cross, but the Gospel of Beauty. At least, it is a Gospel which is not world-renouncing. It is the Gospel of the humanist; certainly it is not the Gospel of the monk. It is a Gospel which finds its heaven here and now and troubles not about the hereafter. The best expression of it in the author's words is as follows:

'A gospel that origins and ends don't matter and that we ought to be influenced by them not at all; that God is veiled, but the veil is good; that we are kin to all that is; that barriers are of our own

making; that the urge of life within us is our guide; and that moralities and revelations and false spiritualities have themselves made sin. And . . . that the true spiritual life consists in the pursuit of learning, experience, and beauty, according to vocation, without fear and for themselves alone' (pp. 300-1).

A nobler and more philosophical expression of it is found in a citation from Richard Lewis Nettleship. He wrote:

'The only strength for me is to be found in the sense of a personal presence everywhere, it scarcely matters whether it be called human or divine. . . . Into this presence we come, not by leaving behind what are usually called earthly things, or by loving them less, but by living more intensely in them, and loving more what is really lovable in them; for it is literally true that this world *is* everything to us, if only we choose to make it so, if only we "live in the present" *because* it is eternity.[1]

Another aspect of it is expressed in a letter of the poet Keats:

'I am certain of nothing but of the holiness of the heart's affections, and the truth of imagination.'[2]

Another aspect of it is expressed in Matthew Arnold's *Memorial Verses* on Goethe:

'He said—the end is everywhere,
Art still has truth, take refuge there.'

Paul Kestern's final religion seems at first sight to have advanced little beyond that of the writer of *Ecclesiastes* (200 B.C.). It might be summed up in the words of the Preacher:

'Rejoice, O young man, in thy youth; and let thy heart cheer thee in the days of thy youth, and walk in the ways of thine heart, and in the sight of thine eyes: but know thou, that for all these things God shall bring thee into judgment.'

Peradventure is *Ecclesiastes* brought up-to-date, but by the omission of that sinister sting of 'judgment to come'—which protrudes through its cheery invitation to present enjoyment.[3]

Yet we must be careful not to do Robert Keable's hero an injustice. He is preaching not merely a Gospel of Beauty and of Enjoyment. His is a Gospel which includes high endeavour and noble service—it is the Epicureanism of Epicurus, not of some of his disciples, but so far as God is concerned, Paul Kestern knows nothing for certain. It is all summed up by the title: *Peradventure*.

[1] *Lectures and Memories*, Vol. I, p. 72. [2] *Letters*, Nov. 22, 1817.
[3] Some of our O.T. critics think these admonitory passages were interpolated by a later hand.

Thus, indirectly, Robert Keable's book answers the demand of A. J. M. Hutchinson's hero. Mark Sabre demands *certainty* in religion. Paul Kestern has come to the conclusion that there is no such thing as certainty in religion: it is all a *peradventure*. Is there, then, no way of reconciling these two? There most certainly is. We find ourselves in agreement with both of them. Robert Keable is right in this: the existence of God is a great peradventure. We cannot prove it to demonstration. A future life is a great peradventure. We cannot prove it to demonstration, and so with all the great moral and spiritual values they are like Bank of England notes, their value depends upon an 'if.' Whilst England is England the Bank of England notes are all right, and whilst the Kingdom of Heaven is a reality the moral and spiritual values are all right—but there is an 'if.' We must admit that.

Yet we are altogether with Mark Sabre. We cannot do with obscurantism in our religion. A religion which we feel is based on false science, doubtful history, dubious arguments—is a religion that can give us but little support and strength. It cannot carry us victorious through seductive temptation; it cannot inspire us with a hope full of immortality; it cannot give us inner strength, and joy, and peace. We must have *certainty* in our religion—yes, and we must have *light*. To have a religion which fears the light; a religion which cannot bear looking into; well that sort of religion is a religion to be ashamed of: it is not the kind of religion to which a modern-minded man can be loyal. This is quite evident. Many men and women to-day have done with the Church because it seems unable to give them the religion which they need and know they need. They want *light* and they get obscurantism: they want *certainty* and they are offered *credulity*. Yet is not this a necessity when Robert Keable expresses the whole religious position by the word *Peradventure?* Not at all. The Christian Religion is a *Peradventure* with the emphasis not on the *per* but on the *adventure*: it is in fact a great adventure. It is a working hypothesis. You begin with an *uncertainty*, but as you advance on the right road you advance in assurance. The situation gradually clears up. St. Paul himself recognised this element of uncertainty. In writing to the Corinthians, he said: 'Here we

see through a glass darkly' or as some would translate it: 'Here we see in a mirror in a riddle'; but in the last extant letter he wrote, he says this: 'I know Him in whom I have believed, and I am persuaded that He is able to guard that which I have committed unto Him against that day.' (II *Tim.* i, 12.)

The Christian Religion is a call to noble endeavour, to high adventure for God: the call of faith comes to men as it came to Abraham, who went out not knowing whither he went. He heard God's call: the call of the spiritual world; the call of whatsoever things are just, pure, lovely, and of good report; the call of that God whose nature he shared and who was calling him to be with Him and to serve Him. If that call be obeyed, that spiritual world from which it came becomes clearer. Assurance grows and 'the called of God' advance towards certainty. Hence the Christian life because it is not a static thing, but a dynamic thing; a progress, not a stand-still; begins with uncertainty but ends with certainty—that is if it be lived in loyalty to the Divine Will. But the certainty which it progressively imparts 'comes through life not through logic'; it comes through experience not through argument. Argument does not take us very far.

> 'Myself when young did eagerly frequent
> Doctor and saint and heard great argument
> About it and about, but ever more
> Came out by the same door wherein I went.'

It is this attitude, the recognition that we are living by a working hypothesis, that we cannot claim absolute certainty, though we ought to be advancing towards it, which is certainly a distinctive note of Modernism. It is summed up for us in Dr. Illingworth's golden saying:

> 'The Christian Religion refuses to be proved first and practised afterwards, its practice and its proof go hand in hand.'

But when we speak of the Christian Religion, let us be sure what we mean by the Christian Religion. It is the religion of Jesus Christ Himself—the religion of the Lord's Prayer, the religion of the Beatitudes, the religion of the Two Great Commandments which bid us love God and our neighbour whole-heartedly. It is not much, if any, of the dogmatic and ecclesiastical *impedimenta* of the Churches which we can hope to prove by Christian faith and Christian endeavour: it is only the very essence of the Gospel—but that is enough.

A CENTURY OF ANGLICAN THEOLOGY

in relation to the general movement of European Thought*

By C. C. J. Webb, M.A., Hon. LL.D., Oriel Professor of the Philosophy of the Christian Religion, Oxford.

II.

These papers are specially concerned with the last hundred years: but in dealing with the thought of any period, it is always necessary to cast one's eye upon that of the preceding period also; and I will accordingly ask your attention to a few remarks about some general tendencies of European thought during the age embracing the later eighteenth and earlier nineteenth centuries, the age which was signalized by the Declaration of American Independence, the French Revolution and the career of the great Napoleon.

An English scholar of the seventeenth century, William Cave, in writing a History of Ecclesiastical Literature, gave to the successive ages with which he was called upon to deal, names indicative of what is most memorable in each: thus he calls the first century of our era the *Saeculum Apostolicum*, the fourth the *Saeculum Arianum*, the thirteenth the *Saeculum Scholasticum*, the sixteenth (the last with which he deals) the *Saeculum Reformatum*, and so with the rest. An author I quoted in my last lecture, Mark Pattison, has suggested that on the same principle the eighteenth century might well be called the *Saeculum Rationalisticum*. My first task will be to call your attention to the tendency to what is called Rationalism, here noted as characteristic of that century, as a preface to an account of a reaction against it which, felt all over Europe in one shape or another, is represented in Anglican theology by the Evangelical movement, a movement which at the date from which my survey is supposed to start—a hundred years ago—had indeed to some extent spent its first force, but was still probably the most vital spiritual power in the religious life of the Church of England.

*Delivered as lectures to Clergy of the Diocese of Oxford, 1921.

In every age in which the passion for knowledge is alive, we may expect to find some one science or group of sciences dominant, by which the best intellect of the time is attracted and by which the view of the world taken by cultivated men is coloured. The dominant intellectual interest of the seventeenth and earlier eighteenth centuries may, I think, be said to have been the interest of mathematical science. This was the age of Galileo, of Descartes, of Pascal, of Newton, of Leibnitz, all of them men of great mathematical genius. Now it was natural that this dominant intellectual interest of the time should show itself in a widespread passion for that clearness and distinction which belong especially to mathematical ideas; and in a tendency to leave out of account whatever in experience may seem to be incapable of being set out in the clear, consecutive and convincing form which is proper to mathematical proof. The chief philosophers of the period from Bacon to Leibnitz we find accordingly dreaming of a presentation of moral and metaphysical truth after a mathematical fashion which, by the use of precise definitions and the observation of such an ordered system of thinking as we find in Euclid, should lead to ethical and metaphysical conclusions as certain and as capable of winning universal assent as the conclusions of arithmetic and geometry. These elements of reality, and especially those elements of human life which do not readily emerge into the full light of consciousness, are in such a period in danger of being neglected. The State, for example, is thought of as deliberately *made* by a social contract, rather than, after a fashion more familiar to us, as, like an organism, '*growing* secretly.' It is attempted to make religion reasonable by the omission or, at least, relegation to the background of what is paradoxical and remote from ordinary ways of thinking—such as, for example, the doctrines of the Trinity in the Godhead, or of salvation by the blood of Christ's atoning sacrifice. Morality is, indeed, brought into prominence relatively to religion because, in contrast with the mystery of religious dogmas and their failure to win acknowledgment outside a restricted circle, the intuitions of conscience are comparatively clear, and the main principles of distinction between right and wrong are generally accepted. There is everywhere a tendency to attend to what is done openly

in the full light of consciousness and a corresponding tendency to disregard in comparison with this those dark roots of experience in the subconscious and unconscious regions of spiritual life, which we are in our days rather in danger of over-emphasizing than of forgetting.

It must not, of course, be overlooked that during all the period, throughout which a certain neglect of these dark roots of spiritual experience was dominant, there were witnesses to the importance of the consideration of them. At the very beginning of it, in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth century, there were great mystics with a profound sense of these: the greatest names among them were those of a Roman Catholic, the Spanish Carmelite, St. John of the Cross, and a Lutheran, the Silesian shoemaker, Jakob Boehme. A century after the latter's death, a great Anglican, William Law, the author of what is, perhaps, among devotional books written by members of the Church of England, the one which can most plausibly be described as a work of genius, I mean *The Serious Call*, a saint and a thinker, and one of the best prose writers of his day, introduced into this country the doctrines of Boehme, or, as he was generally called in England, Behmen. Somewhat later, a very different man, also a great Anglican, Joseph Butler, Bishop of Durham, insisted in his famous *Analogy* on the point that what is generally called Deism—the belief, widely held in his day, that a thoughtful survey of Nature might lead to a belief in a wise and good God, unembarrassed by the difficulties which beset the doctrines of historical Christianity—would after all not fulfil its promises just because it ignored the difficulties—for example, the waste of life involved in the course of what men had not then learnt to call the 'struggle for existence'—which would perplex any thorough-going seeker for God in the facts of nature, no less than the mysteries of revelation perplexed the enquirer into the doctrines of Christianity. Even among the great mathematical thinkers themselves, there were not lacking signs of protests against the rationalism which concentration on mathematical and physical studies had fostered. Thus we have Pascal's saying that the heart has its reasons which the reason does not know. And if rationalism, fostered by mathematical and physical studies, led, as it doubtless did, to

neglect of the region of spiritual life which lies below the threshhold of consciousness, one of the greatest mathematicians and philosophers of the age, Leibnitz, was led by his interest as a mathematician in the thought of continuity to insist upon the existence of such a subconscious region, continuous with our conscious life; and so to point the way in which, in latter days, so many psychologists have followed him in the exploration of this obscure background from which our conscious life seems to emerge, as the islands in the sea are in truth peaks of submarine mountain ranges overtopping the level below which the greater part of the chain is permanently sunk.

There were, however, more or less isolated exceptions to the general rule that, during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, it was what was clear and distinct and orderly and able to give a good account of itself before the tribunal of good sense and calm judgment that appealed to the general temper of the time. What is mysterious, strange, weird, inexpressible in language has little attraction for those imbued with the rationalistic temper; at the best it might amuse an idle hour. 'Enthusiasm' is with them a term of reproach, suggesting only extravagance and a want of self-control. But no one familiar with the history of ideas will be surprised to find that as the *Saeculum Rationalisticum* (to use Pattison's name for the period) went on, there began to reveal itself side by side with this exclusive delight in what can be clearly and distinctly conceived, with this tendency to limit the sphere of Reason to what, being highly abstract, most easily permits itself to be thus clearly and distinctly conceived (for example, the quantities and magnitudes studied by mathematicians), with this comparative neglect of the obscure and the subconscious as being irrational rather than as being provocative of more hardy attempts of Reason to master the less amenable material which they offered to its consideration, an exactly opposite tendency. This was a tendency to insist on the supreme value of feeling or sentiment, and brought about at last a real danger that all care for what is rational or sensible should be submerged by a flood of emotion. This tendency manifested itself first in a succession of religious movements with a strongly-marked emotional side —in the Protestant world in Pietism, Moravianism, Methodism,

and in the Roman Catholic Church in the rise of the devotion of the Sacred Heart, originating in the visions of a French nun of the late seventeenth century, the Blessed Marie-Marguerite Alacoque, the imagery connected with which devotion reminds us so closely of that to be found in the hymns produced by the more or less contemporary movements in the Protestant Churches.

At last this tendency, which I may call for short 'sentimental,' without implying by that word any criticism of it, but only that it lays its principal stress upon *feeling* as contrasted with *reason;* this 'sentimental' tendency revealed itself as a great intellectual force in Jean Jacques Rousseau. There is to be found in Lord Morley's book upon Rousseau a very interesting account of his far-reaching influence upon every department of the spiritual life of Europe. I will here confine myself to the theological aspects of this influence, before coming to exhibit the Evangelical movement in the Church of England as the Anglican representation of the tendency for which Rousseau stands in the general history of European thought. And I will also add to what I have to say about Rousseau himself something about certain developments of his principles which we may associate respectively with the French Revolution, for which Rousseau did so much to pave the way: with the moral philosophy of Kant, upon which Rousseau exercised, as Kant tells us, in a certain way a decisive influence: and with the work of the poet Goethe in the next generation. To both these developments something corresponding may be observed in the Evangelicalism which in Anglican theology reflects the whole movement of which Rousseau is in general literature the central figure.

The contrast between the civilized state and a state of nature which might be supposed to lie behind it was a very old one; but it had not always been understood in the same way. The English philosopher Hobbes in the seventeenth century had described the state of nature as 'poor, nasty, solitary, brutish, short'—in other words, as a mere animal existence. Rousseau and his followers were, on the other hand, disposed to regard it as better than civilization had come to be. Hence the new movement ran counter to the preference which, in the pre-

ceding age, the Age of Rationalism, as I called it, men generally felt for what is cultivated and civilized over what is undomesticated and wild; and we may note that this might seem to bring it into line with the theological tradition which had regarded the history of civilization as beginning in a fall from innocence, and had refused to allow that human nature could expect to attain perfection by making the best of its own resources, and asserted its absolute need of a supply from without of supernatural grace. The tradition, although out of sympathy with the prevailing tone of the Age of Rationalism with its confidence in Reason, its satisfaction with the gifts of civilization, was by no means new. It had indeed during that period been especially emphasized by the Calvinists in the Protestant Churches and by the Jansenists in the Roman Catholic Church in opposition to what seemed to them the acquiescence of Arminians and of Jesuits in the prevailing tendency to exalt unduly the native powers of humanity and the value of what was achieved by these alone. But this theological tradition was in opposition to this prevailing tendency, and the comparative depreciation of the results of civilization by Rousseau might, as I said, seem to reinforce it in so far as this also saw in the actual history of civilization the story of a corruption rather than of an improvement. But it could not be said that its emphasis on the need of divine grace or its requirement of the conviction of sin as the first step to be taken in the spiritual life was reinforced by the new philosophy. Rather that philosophy was marked by reticence upon and a trust in the native instincts of that human heart which the sterner schools of theology had regarded as 'desperately wicked.' Despite this great difference, however, between the tradition of Christian theology and the teaching associated with the name of Rousseau, it is here (as Lord Morley points out in the book to which I have already referred) that he was a pioneer of religious revival. Voltaire and the deists of the generation before Rousseau had believed in a God (you may still see at Ferney the church which, as the inscription on its portico proclaims, *Deo Erexit Voltaire*) whom it was indeed reasonable and right to honour, but with whom no intimate communion was to be enjoyed. Rousseau's conception of God may indeed have been no less vague: but God

was for him an object of ecstatic emotion. He could lie murmuring *O Grand Être, Grand Être*, rapt in feelings of adoration which would have been foolishness to Voltaire. Appearing when and where it did, this new kind of piety showed that one must either pass beyond the cold deism of Voltaire to the open atheism of some of the Encyclopædists, or with Rousseau to a more intimate realization in feeling of a Divinity which, as a mere inference from the order of nature, was rapidly fading from men's view. Rousseau stands for the sentiment of God, as he does also for the sentiment of Nature, but rather for *sentiment* in both cases than for effort to *know* either. Thus the two great contemporaries, born in the same year, 1770, the German philosopher Hegel and the English poet Wordsworth alike pre-suppose Rousseau, but pass beyond him in an effort to *know* what Rousseau did but *feel*.

The great French Revolution (which was not only a French Revolution) may be from one point of view regarded as the explosion of the combined forces of Rationalism and its opposite and successor, Sentimentalism—forces typified respectively by two great writers, Voltaire and Rousseau. Rationalism, with its emphasis on clear and distinct understanding, its neglect of obscure processes of growth and development, its corresponding indifference to tradition, had undermined genuine belief in the political and religious traditions which were embodied in the structure of Church and State. But by itself Rationalism was too careless of sentiment in general to afford a substitute for the sentiments which the traditional order of society had created. It was, on the whole, aristocratic, for clear and distinct understanding is plainly for the few and not for the common mass of men; it did not therefore aim at disturbing the ideas of the people at large, who were perhaps only to be kept in order by the help of superstitious beliefs in rewards and penalties supposed to be entailed by obedience or disobedience to laws whose true ground they could not be expected to appreciate. The Rationalist's very lack of sympathy with the dogmas of the established religion made him powerless, and not very desirous, to disturb their hold over those who were not guided by reason.

The Sentimentalism of Rousseau, though in a way the very

opposite of this Rationalism, came in to complete what it had left incomplete. Just as the *sentiment* of Nature, of man's natural equality, was able to take the *heart* out of an interested belief in aristocratic superiority which Rationalism had already deprived of any convincing sanctions, so too the *sentiment* of undogmatic religion was able to touch with a certain enthusiasm the alienation of men from an established system in the *truth* of the principles underlying which they themselves, and not only they but even many of the official representatives of the established system itself, had ceased to have any convinced belief. An order of society, then, in Church and State alike, which neither in *belief* nor yet in *feeling* had a serious faith in itself, was bound to go down before the rationalistic belief in an abstract theory to which the traditional institutions by no means corresponded, as soon as this *belief* in the abstract theory was reinforced by the *sentiment* for human equality and the common nature of man, in which high and low were alike. We must think, then, of Rousseau's teaching for our present purpose together with the revolutionary consequences of that teaching, consequences which were dependent upon an abstract theory of human equality, a sentiment for the common nature of man, which led to impatience with the historical institutions which had produced distinctions whether social, national or racial among those who shared in that nature, and which it was thought must be swept away or, at any rate, allowed to decay and left to die if that common nature was to attain to its full natural expression.

I said that there were other developments of Rousseau's teaching on which I wished to say a word before proceeding to show how the Evangelical movement in Anglican theology reflected this Sentimentalist movement—developments which I associated with the names of Kant and Goethe respectively.

Kant tells us himself that he was by natural bent a scientific enquirer or researcher, and began by despising the common folk who had no part in the pursuit of learning and knowledge to which his own life was devoted; but that he was convinced by the study of Rousseau to abandon this overwhelming estimate of the dignity of his own special vocation and to learn reverence for the common humanity which binds us to all, whether

high or low, who possess the simple consciousness of duty, as distinct from and, it may be, opposed to, inclination. It is, however, to be noted that this sense of a common humanity takes in Kant, in accordance with the peculiarity of his personal character, the form of an austere respect for duty rather than the form of benevolent sentiment; yet we have his own word for it that the great master of sentiment, Rousseau, was his master here: and it is not without significance that, as the movement which culminated in Rousseau had, before Rousseau's day, taken a religious form in the Pietism of Germany (of which our English Methodism and, through Methodism, our English Evangelicalism, were direct decendants), it was in a Pietistic household that Kant had been brought up, and an eminent Pietistic clergyman had been the first person of superior position to interest himself in the saddler's boy who was to become the most illustrious thinker of modern times. And though there remained very little of the Pietist in the mature Kant, either as regards opinion or as regards sentiment, yet the depth and strength of his moral experience, the witness of which no difficulty in reconciling the freedom which it required with the determinism no less decidedly postulated by our scientific investigations could avail to make him doubt for a moment, may well have owed something to what his schoolfellow, the classical scholar Ruhnken, writing to Kant after both had become famous, calls 'that harsh, yet useful and by no means to be regretted, discipline which we underwent from the fanatics.'

The poet Goethe indeed considered it Kant's great service, by his insistence on duty rather than on feeling, to have lifted his cultivated countrymen from the slough of sentimentality into which, to a great extent under the influence of Rousseau's writings, they had been sinking. This sentimentality had taken in the second generation a profoundly pessimistic form—in English literature we may take the poet Byron as the type of this development—and Goethe, who had known by experience the sense of dissatisfaction and despair which it engendered, had purged himself of it by writing the *Sorrows of Werther*, a story of love and suicide, suggested by the actual life and death of a young contemporary of his own under the influence of an indulged melancholy of this kind, induced in

his case by a hopeless passion for another man's wife. We must remember, then, that we must associate with the general tendency of thought and feeling to which I have attached the name of Rousseau, and which I propose to show you was echoed in Anglican theology by the Evangelical movement, not only the sentiment of Rousseau himself for Nature and for a God immanent in Nature, but also the indifference to history which was so markedly manifested both in the political ideals of the revolutionary period and in the moral philosophy of Kant. For Kant dwells upon our common nature as rational beings, and the duty which belongs to us as such, and takes little account of the different standards characteristic of different stages of historical nationalities; or again, of the historical process through which men have been brought to a realization of their common humanity or the conscience has been matured to the point at which it would respond to Kant's teaching about the 'categorical imperative' or unconditional command of duty. And besides this again we have to remember, as a feature of the general tendency which the Evangelical movement represents in Anglican theology, that vivid realization of the disappointment and vanity of life which is so often caused by reaction from highly-strung sentiment, and which obtained literary embodiment in Goethe's *Sorrows of Werther* as well as in much of the poetry of Byron.

Let us now turn at last to the Evangelical movement in the Church of England, and see how the various features of the great spiritual movement of the age are there represented.

It is obvious, in the first place, that this Evangelicalism reacts against the rationalism of the period in which it arose by its emphasis on feeling, on the heart. 'Lord,' says the poet of the movement, 'it is my chief complaint, that my love is weak and faint.' A new stress is laid on conversion, less as a changed course of conduct than as a conscious difference of attitude towards God; sacramental incorporation into the Church and intellectual conviction of the truth of Christianity are secondary to the first-hand experience which is attested by the crushing sense of sin, the personal response to the offer of salvation, the inward assurance of pardon, which marked the stages of the spiritual drama of the individual sinner's reconciliation to God

in Christ. It would, of course, be absurd to suppose that these things were unknown before the end of the eighteenth century, or are only found in those whom one would call Evangelicals in theology. But unquestionably these things stand out for Evangelicalism, as they do not for other forms of Christian piety, as the distinctive features of the religious life; unquestionably there was, at the period of which I am speaking, a rediscovery of their importance in which we cannot but recognize the form taken by the sentimental revolt against rationalism in the minds of those children of the age for whom religion, rather than science or art or politics, was the principal interest of life.

I have already quoted some lines of Cowper, the sweetest singer of English Evangelicalism. Do we not see in his sad despair, to which he gave such memorable and terrible expression in his poem of the Castaway, something akin to the *unglückliche Bewusstsein*, 'the unhappy consciousness' as the philosopher Hegel was afterwards to call such states of mind, which brought into fashion such suicide as that of Jerusalem, the original of Goethe's Werther, and which breathes in the pages of Senancour's *Obermann* (the deep impression made by which our Matthew Arnold has commemorated in two well-known poems, *In Memory of the Author of Obermann* and *Obermann Once More*), or again in those of the *Réné* of the great French prose poet Chateaubriand? There is indeed a true kinship between the gentle recluse of Olney and these sad spirits, but yet, even though the disordered intellect of Cowper fastening on the fearful dogma which he had learned from his Calvinistic teachers made him in theory the most hopeless of them all, his sincere piety in fact touches his melancholy with a sort of gentle radiance which that of his less religious fellows lacks:

> 'Sometimes a light surprises
> The Christian when he sings:
> It is the Lord who rises
> With healing in his wings.'

To the Evangelical, in the famous phrase of Newman, who in his *Apologia* fully acknowledges his debt to the Evangelical teaching under which he received his earliest religious impressions, the 'two, and two only, supreme and luminous self-evident beings' were himself and his Creator. A certain individualism of outlook arising from preoccupation with the inner

drama of one's own spiritual life is another feature in which Evangelicalism reflects the character of the great movement of which Rousseau is the literary protagonist; and with this individualism of outlook goes a lack of interest in the individual's historical setting and antecedents, and a consequent general lack of historical perspective which, as we have already seen, characterized the political ideals of the Revolution and the moral philosophy of Kant, and which is no less evident in some conspicuous features of Evangelical theology; for instance, in its tendency to isolate the Scriptures, to disparage the authority of ecclesiastical tradition, and to belittle the mediation of the Church.

Such individualism of outlook must not, however, be regarded as implying egoism or selfishness. No doubt selfishness may have sometimes clothed itself in the forms of Evangelical piety as in other disguises which lay ready to its hand, but the natural result of Evangelical individualism was not selfishness but rather a passionate love of individual souls. The great outburst of missionary zeal which marked the beginning of the nineteenth century, the abolition of the slave-trade, the Factory Acts, associated respectively with the names of Carey and Martyn, of Wilberforce and of Shaftesbury are a sufficient proof of this. No movement has been richer in works of practical philanthropy than Evangelicalism. And here too once more it is true to the general character of the wider movement with which it is historically connected, while touching it with a religious fervour which it has elsewhere sometimes lacked. We have seen how the study of Rousseau converted Kant to a respect for all men, simple as well as learned, which found expression in his ethical doctrine that we are 'to treat humanity in our own person, or in that of another, always as an end and never merely as a means'; and we have seen, too, how the same Rousseau's teaching fired the zeal of the French revolutionaries for the rights of man. The politics of English Evangelicalism were marked by a characteristically English sobriety and conservatism which had little in common with the violence and radicalism of continental republicanism; but the two were less apart in their ultimate inspiration than their respective followers would have readily allowed. And indeed it is not at all

my intention to suggest in this account of the relation of Evangelicalism to the European movement with which I have brought it into connexion, that its kinship with that movement was something of which Evangelicals or their leaders were for the most part aware. The names of Rousseau and of Kant would to the majority of them have been the names of dangerous enemies of the truth they prized; the former would have been familiar, but execrated; the latter unfamiliar but, so far as known, thought of as belonging to a world outside the circle of those who shared an experience which was to them the one pearl of great price, and which they were too apt to think inseparable from certain ways of thinking and speaking which they had come to regard as its necessary tokens and evidences.

But I have already pointed out in my first lecture that the isolation characteristic of Anglican theology often comes out in the fact that it echoes world movements without intending to do so or being aware that it does so. We shall see this illustrated again in the history of the next great movement, that which has often been named the Oxford Movement, because it is at Oxford that it first found an articulate voice in *The Christian Year* and the *Tracts for the Times*.

THE PROPHETIC MINISTRY OF THE NEW REFORMATION

By the Rev. R. Meiklejohn, B.D., LL.B.

IT is a significant fact that the pulpit has, in these latter days, ceased to dominate the minds of men. It may be questioned if it even seriously influences them, except perhaps in a few specially favoured places, where preachers of personality and power may still be found. The age of sermons has passed away and the age of ceremonies has succeeded it. The multitudes no longer sit at the feet of the prophet, thrilled by his impassioned earnestness, moved by the manifestly divine quality of his message. They have now no splendid vision of God, no true appreciation of the grandeur of human life. They are no longer stirred by deep emotions or attracted by high ideals. They are possessed of no definite religious convictions, they are capable of no sustained spiritual effort. The cause of this dis-

tressful condition is sufficiently obvious even to the most casual observer. The prophetic line is extinct. There is no one whose teaching is of authority. The great mass of the accredited teachers of religion is infected with Scribism. Where there is no vision the people perish.

The fact is to be regretted, for even the most hardened sacerdotalist can scarcely deny to the ministry of the Word a co-equal dignity with the ministry of the Sacraments. And indeed, whatever theoretic equality may exist, it is an indubitable fact that the prophet has always exercised an incomparably greater influence upon the minds of men than has the priest. Those priests who have most moved their contemporaries have done so, not by the splendid pageantry of their services, not by the solemn symbolism of their altars, but by the moving inspiration of their spoken word. They have achieved success only in so far as they have merged the priestly in the prophetic office, only when they have deliberately sacrificed the sacerdotal vestment, and with it the sacerdotal mind, for the raiment of camel's hair and the mind of the man of God.

The gradual process by which the prophet is being eliminated, the slow decay of the preaching ministry, will, unless it is speedily arrested, prove fatal to the vital and vitalizing life of the Church. The prophetic mind is creative; the priestly mind is merely imitative. The prophet strives to make all things new; the priest is restrained by the icy grip of the dead hand reaching out from a dark and distant past. The prophet pursues a great ideal with unswerving directness, deathless courage, and unquenchable hope; the priest runs round in hopeless circles like the traveller lost in the desert. It is in the revival, therefore, of the prophetic office that the salvation of the Church is to be found. It is by diligent study and persuasive preaching, rather than by sumptuous services and sensuous music that the clergy of the Church must regain their hold upon the men of the world. The ministry of the Word must come into its own, or the Church, as a *human* institution, will cease to exist.

Unfortunately the party which is now dominant in the ecclesiastical world tends to minimize the importance of sound and effective preaching. High Anglicanism is almost exclusively interested in the magnification of the sacramental idea. The

altar, rather than the pulpit, is the centre of its universe. The service of the sanctuary is to its clergy the great duty of their lives. The sermon is a matter of minor importance.

Such is the attitude of the most influential party in the English Church at a time when, more urgently than ever before, the world is seeking for spiritual leadership. It might perhaps be imagined that, through the default of High Anglicanism, the party which stands at the opposite pole of the ecclesiastical world would supply the pressing need of a preaching ministry. Evangelicalism has never been sacerdotal or excessively sacramental, and has always cherished the prophetic tradition and honoured the prophetic office. A hundred years ago the Evangelicals were, perhaps, the strongest force within the Church. The Wesleyan revival had been their inspiration, and within the limitations of the Establishment they had adopted something of the Wesleyan method and achieved much of the Wesleyan success. If their clergy preached almost exclusively upon one Christian doctrine, determining, with St. Paul, to know only Christ and Him crucified, they preached with an impassioned sincerity and conviction, which impressed their age no less by its earnestness than by its novelty. But the brilliant promise of the youth of Evangelicalism has not been fulfilled in its maturer years. The reason is not far to seek. Biblical criticism, the product of the inquiring mind of the nineteenth century, shattered its belief in the literal truth of the Divine Word; and it was upon the literal truth of the Divine Word that the preaching power of Evangelicalism depended. It was not so much disturbed by the destructive criticism of the Old Testament, though that was sufficiently alarming; but it was grievously distressed when of logical necessity the same process of literary investigation was applied to the New. It was willing, under pressure, to be sceptical about the whale's capacity to swallow Jonah; it refused absolutely to face the far profounder problem which centred round the personality of Jesus of Nazareth. And so, because it failed to perceive the trend of modern thought, it failed, despite its manifest prophetic qualities, to grip the modern mind.

The writer is strongly persuaded that the prophetic ministry of the future will be the product of the third and greatest party

within the English Church. A modern writer has not unjustly observed that 'it is probable that no real revival of religion will take place amongst us till the Church has escaped from the backwash of the two great ecclesiastical movements of the nineteenth century, the Evangelical and the Tractarian, and resumed its normal position on the religious curve.' The Liberal Party, whose great tradition goes back to the school of Falkland, Hales, Chillingworth and the Cambridge Platonists, is at last coming into its own. Liberalism, in the last century, tended to further that normal growth in theological science and that normal development of ecclesiastical polity which Evangelicalism and Tractarianism had almost succeeded in arresting. It was manifesting a friendliness for Dissent, which sought to reverse the historic blunders of the seventeenth century. It was enthusiastic for the wide application of the principles of Christ to every national, social, and industrial interest. It exhibited a willingness to investigate, in an open, fearless manner, the new problems which the development of scientific and literary criticism was disclosing. But it formed no great party and inaugurated no far-reaching movement. It was the conviction of very many thinking English Churchmen; but it was a conviction felt rather than expressed, a habit of thought and life rather than a definite statement of opinion and belief. Liberalism was articulate only in the few; and those few had to bear the suspicions of unprogressive, and the almost vindictive hatred of reactionary Churchmen. It is the habit of the world, especially of the ecclesiastical world, to stone its prophets.

It was the defect of the Liberal party of the nineteenth century that it was not only thus unorganized, but that it was, to a very considerable extent, academic, and remote from the turmoil and confusions of modern religious life. With a few noteworthy exceptions, the great Liberal divines of the nineteenth century were not unlike the great Latitudinarian philosophers of the seventeenth. They were men of books rather than of affairs, leaders in thought rather than captains in action. But now, in the present century, Liberalism has emerged from the peaceful seclusion of the study to proclaim its gospel in the highways and byways and market places of the modern world. The long years of preparation have come to an end. The torch

of learning has been handed on to a younger, more active, more enthusiastic generation. Liberalism is massing its ranks and is going forth into the battle and the shouting and the dust. It is beginning to blaze the trail for mankind to follow into the Kingdom of God.

From this younger Liberal party there will arise, within a decade or less, a new prophetic school. Through the labours of this school, the ministry of the Word will be restored to its rightful importance and endued with an effectiveness which, except in isolated instances, it has never possessed before. The new prophetic school will be strongly institutional, but it will always think of the institution in which the Spirit of Christ is embodied, and by which it is expressed, as the *Kingdom* rather than as the *Church*. It will proclaim a conception of the Kingdom infinitely wider than any existing conception. It will aim at an ideal infinitely more spacious and comprehensive than the existing ideals of mutually hostile and conflicting denominations. It will seek to break down all walls of partition and to achieve, amid a diversity of forms and ceremonies and governments, that unity of spiritual aim and effort for which Christendom has always so wistfully yearned and which it has never been able to accomplish. It will set its face like flint against those who imagine they are serving the God of all mankind by perpetuating old and out-worn prejudices or by fomenting narrow and bigoted fanaticisms.

And yet, since any preaching ministry which is to touch the hearts of men must be mystical, the new prophetic school will possess the mystical quality. All the great prophets of the past have been mystics. They have sought, not only to regenerate societies, but to bring individuals into direct and immediate touch with God. That is why they have always assessed sacerdotalism at its proper value, and have been more than contemptuous of the blood of bulls and of goats. The prophet of the future will adopt the same method and pursue the same end. He will teach his disciples a mature and not a primitive, a mystical and not a magical, religion. He will proclaim God—if we may adapt the words of the Dean of St. Paul's to our context—'not as an object, but as an atmosphere. His creed will be simplified and intensified. He will preach the power

and vitality and intimacy of that spiritual presence, which St. Paul called Christ. He will tell men that the Christ of experience is at once their moral ideal and the power that transforms them according to that ideal; that the normal development of religion culminates in that experience of complete harmony with a loving and wise spiritual Power, which St. Paul expresses in the simple word: 'For me to live is Christ.'[1]

And, finally, the preaching of the new prophetic school will be effective, not only because it will proclaim that moral unity for which Christendom longs, not only because it will satisfy, simply and directly, the desire of the human heart for God, but because it will offer to the inquiring mind a rational presentation of the fudamental truths of religion. It is the common assertion of the opponents of Liberal Christianity that its methods are merely destructive, that, in a sceptical spirit, it remorsely seeks to destroy the idea of the Christian Church, to mutilate beyond recognition the Christian Bible, and to evacuate of all doctrinal significance the Christian Creeds. The assertion is simply untrue. Every Liberal Churchman knows that the work to which he is pledged is constructive; that he seeks to enlarge the idea of the Christian Church, to re-discover the essentially spiritual teaching of the Christian Bible, and to re-interpret Christian dogma in a manner which shall confirm rather than weaken belief. It is the traditional Church, hardened and fossilized; it is the unexamined and unexplained Bible, invested with an impossible, fictitious sanctity; it is the stereotyped Creed, placed under an irrational, priestly tabu, that repels the thoughtful mind of the present age. The new preaching will derive no small part of its power from a frank and courageous recognition of these facts. Only when the broken ruins of collapsed beliefs are removed can the work of reconstruction be begun.

Already is appearing, surely and unmistakably, the dawn of a better day. Like the prodigal, wretchedly poor, desperately unhappy, disgusted with past follies, sickened with the futilities of a present aimless existence, humanity is coming to itself. In a little while the new prophetic line will arise to lead it back to God.

[1] Inge, *Truth and Falsehood in Religion*, p. 89.

THE ADVENT HOPE*

I.

THE prayers and Scriptures and hymns at our church services for Advent are arranged to remind us of Christ's return in glory to judge the quick and the dead. Yet it must be confessed that we do not think of this return of Christ as our forefathers did. A modern historian asserts that the Return of Christ has 'ceased to arouse any emotional interest.'[2] Certainly we do not ask: When will this return of Christ to earth take place? And if people tell us that, as a result of their study of Scripture and their observation of the signs of the times, we may expect the return of Christ in the year 1923, or 1924, we listen with a certain bored politeness, but wonder in our hearts how they can possibly think as they do. And what is our reason for this? Is it that we are convinced that 'of that day and that hour knoweth no one, neither the angels in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father only'? (*Mk.* xiii, 22; *Mt.* xxiv, 36, and *Acts* i, 7). No, it is because we have given up all hope of its ever taking place at all. That I believe to be the case with the vast majority of the educated classes of this country. As for our uneducated classes—and they are a diminishing multitude—only a very limited number of them hold fast the Advent Hope in its traditional form. The form, I mean, in which it is presented for instance in Thomas of Celano's magnificent hymn:

'Dies irae, dies illa
Solvet saeclum in favilla.'

or in Charles Wesley's triumphant paen:

'Lo! He comes with clouds descending
Once for favoured sinners slain,
Thousand thousand saints attending
Swell the triumph of His train,
Alleluia! Alleluia!
Christ appears on earth again.'

The fact that such a propaganda as '*Millions now living will never die*'—some of you have no doubt seen the booklet[3]—

[1] A sermon preached on the First Sunday in Advent, in St. Mary-the-Virgin, Oxford, to junior members of the University, by the Rev. H. D. A. Major, B.D. [2] Prof. Bury: *The Idea of Progress*, p. 351.

[3] *Millions now living will never die*, by Judge Rutherford, 128 pp., 1/- post free; pub. International Bible Students' Association.

can gain adherents to-day—few perhaps in England, yet many more in America—seems to some of us modern Christians amazing; yet let us not forget that this crude and dramatic eschatology constituted the Advent Hope of the whole Christian Church until quite modern times. It was the hope with which St. Paul bade the Thessalonian Christians comfort themselves;[4] and so far as we can tell, it was the conviction of all the primitive apostles, and possibly of all the New Testament writers, with the exception perhaps of the author of the Fourth Gospel and First Epistle, which are called John's. Yet for us the archangel's trump, the return of Christ seated on the clouds, the rising of the dead from their graves, the assembling of all humanity for judgment before the great white throne—things which the Christian Church has expected for eighteen hundred years with a mingled thrill of exultation and terror—have passed away under the influence of modern critical research and the modern scientific outlook. I need not say that there may be serious loss in this exit; for the expectation of this dramatic close of human history on this planet was bound up in the minds of many with belief in the providence and rulership of God: it brought home to them their personal accountability to God; it caused them to realize the transitory character of human history, and the valuelessness of human success and mundane prosperity, unless that prosperity and success were the reward of moral action and had set on them the seal of the final righteous judgment of God.

With the abandonment of the traditional view, Christ's Advent, from being the Church's Hope, has become the Church's Problem. Academic Church circles have rung with the voices of the disputants in the eschatological controversy and the discussion of the question: Did Jesus Himself actually teach these things, or did they come into the primitive Gospel and into the primitive Church not from Jesus Himself, but from the Jewish apocalyptists and those Jewish Christians whose eschatological expectations were mainly instrumental in leading them to accept Jesus as the Messiah?[5] I would urge that in this

[4] I *Thess.*, iv, 18.

[5] See, for the most recent contributions to this controversy, *The Lord of Thought*, by L. Dougall and C. W. Emmet (1922).

matter the most important issue is not whether Jesus voiced the Advent Hope in eschatological language, and taught it in the form in which it appears in the Jewish Apocalypses, but whether He did not include in that conception important elements unknown to contemporary Judaism. For example, it is certain that the Advent Hope which Jesus taught was divorced from nationalism, while the apocalyptists were wedded to it.

II.

Concurrently with the weakening of belief in the traditional Advent Hope, there was growing up in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, especially in France, England and Germany, a belief in human progress. An admirable account of the origin and progress of the idea of progress appeared from the pen of Professor Bury in 1920. The growth of the idea of progress, as he points out, has been closely connected with the growth of modern science (particularly biological science), with the growth of rationalism, and with the struggle for political and religious liberty.[6]

It was this idea of progress which the Dean of St. Paul's attacked so fiercely in his Romanes Lecture of 1920 as a popular but discredited idol, although Mr. A. J. Balfour (now Lord Balfour) some thirty years ago had in an address delivered at Glasgow expressed serious doubts as to whether the belief was soundly based. However, it is not surprising that men came to believe in it, when those who were regarded as great leaders of thought in the nineteenth century were so sure of it, *e.g.* Darwin, wrote :

> ' All corporeal and mental environments will tend to progress towards perfection.'[7]

Herbert Spencer wrote :

> ' Progress is not an accident, but a necessity. What we call evil and immorality must disappear. It is certain that man must become perfect.[8]

And again :

> ' Always towards perfection is the mighty movement—towards a complete development and a more unmixed good. . . . Even in evils the student learns to recognise only a struggling beneficence. But above all he is struck with the inherent sufficingness of things.'[9]

[6] See Bury : *The Idea of Progress*, p. 348. [7] Cited by Bury, p. 336.
[8] Cited by Inge : *Outspoken Essays*, 2nd series (1922), p. 163.
[9] Bury cited, p. 340.

That trenchant controversialist, Professor Huxley, was able to discern in man's

> 'Long progress through the past, a reasonable ground of faith in his attainment of a nobler future.'

But one must add that these optimistic hopes of an earthly paradise were not shared by all the great thinkers of the period. We have noted the doubts of Mr. Balfour—but he was not alone. Hermann Lotze did not anticipate the Millenium, and that because of the constitution of human nature; moreover, the kind of paradise predicted did not attract him. He wrote:

> 'Never one fold and one shepherd, never one uniform culture for all mankind, never universal nobleness. Our virtue and happiness can only flourish amid an active conflict with wrong. If every stumbling block were smoothed away, men would no longer be like men, but like a flock of innocent brutes, feeding on good things provided by nature as at the very beginning of their course.'[10]

And von Hartmann revived the idea of J. J. Rousseau 'that civilization and happiness are mutually antagonistic, and that progress means an increase of misery.'[11] But these were voices crying in the wilderness or like the disquieting and ineffective utterance of Micaiah, the son of Imlah, faced by Ahab's four hundred prophets. Biological research, scientific invention, the accumulation of material wealth, the spread of popular education, the advance of rationalism, the growing popularity of democratic and socialist ideals, all in their particular way contributed to assist the belief in progress. With few exceptions, all were awaiting the inevitable advent of a mundane society in which disease would be non-existent, poverty abolished, crime eliminated, war impossible, the ape and tiger as well as the primitive donkey in man all worked out, and the span of human life prolonged.[12]

This cheerful expectation of a terrestrial Utopia more than compensated most educated people for the loss of the traditional Advent Hope; but then there came the War, the most terrible and sanguinary that human history has known, followed by the revolting horrors of Russian Bolshevism, Irish Terrorism and Greek and Turkish barbarism, and the idea of human progress

[10] Cited by Bury, p. 343, *Microcosmus*, Bk. VII, 5, E.T., p. 300.
[11] Bury, *op. cit.*, p. 344.
[12] See also Inge's *Outspoken Essays* (2nd series), p. 163.

was shattered in the minds of many. The aged Victorian in many cases became a pessimist, and the young Georgian, with a keen appetite for enjoyment, preferred to utilize the present to the best of his ability, and give as little thought as possible to a quite unpredictable future. Max Beerbohm's caricature exactly presented the contrast between the Victorian and Georgian outlooks. A comfortable Victorian with side-whiskers sees in the future a magnified image of himself. A slim young Georgian wearing a mourning band sees only a great note of interrogation. Probably of the two outlooks, the Georgian is more wholesome than the Victorian. To be an agnostic is better than to be a materialist and a determinist, although it is not so comfortable. It is better to be quite uncertain about progress than to believe that it is a sort of mechanical necessity; that progress in material things means real progress; and that an increase in scientific knowledge can achieve alone a desirable and stable civilization. A satirist has said that the American idea of progress is acceleration. But what are our triumphs in electricity really worth when, as another satirist has said, they 'seem to convey us with unparalleled rapidity from over-crowding and vice in Battersea to over-crowding and vice in Hoxton.'[13]

Huxley in his later years came to take a less sanguine view of human progress when he recognized clearly that real progress depended upon the ethical development of mankind. It appeared to him that man's moral nature, which is very feeble and fluctuating, is faced by terrible odds, and that in the course of history it had gone down with painful frequency. He wrote:

> 'I know of no study which is so saddening as that of the evolution of humanity. . . . Man is a brute, only more intelligent than other brutes.' 'The theory of evolution encourages no millenial anticipations.' 'Social progress means the checking of the cosmic process at every step and the substitution for it of another which may be called the ethical process.'[14]

I believe most of us are coming round to this view. We have parted with the Christian Advent Hope in its traditional form; we have also parted with the optimistic Spencerian faith in inevitable human progress.

[13] E. J. Bicknell: *The Christian Idea of Sin*, p. 107.

[14] Cited by Bury, *op. cit.*, pp. 344-5.

III.

What remains for us as we face the future? Only a great note of interrogation? No; there remains the ideal of the coming of the Kingdom of God on earth. This differs widely from the nineteenth century idea of progress. It is essentially and fundamentally moral and spiritual. It is based on faith in a Divine Providence, a Divine Over-ruling and a Divine Ideal for humanity, and that faith, as Lord Balfour's recent lecture at Glasgow indicates, has strong arguments to support it. In order to believe in a possible Kingdom of God on earth, it is first needful to believe in a Kingdom of God in heaven; in other words, to believe in a spiritual world. 'Thy Kingdom come, Thy will be done, on earth as it is in heaven.' Next it is needful to believe in co-operation with this spiritual world, and to realize that all hope of the Kingdom of God coming on earth depends on man's co-operation with this spiritual world. In other words, to believe in the Kingdom of God we must believe in God, and the need for God's strength and help gained by communion with Him if the Kingdom of God is to come at all in this world. Canning, the statesman, dealing with a political situation, exclaimed: 'I call in the new world to redress the balance of the old.' So if the Kingdom of God is to come on earth, it is needful to secure the help and inspiration and strength and self-sacrifice which alliance with the Kingdom of God in heaven can alone secure; in other words, sane and life-giving relations with the Eternal. It is this alliance, this co-operation, which the Gospel of Christ advocates and consecrates, and wherever and whenever it has been in some measure realized, there the Kingdom of God has begun to come. What that has meant and may mean we can find delightfully and truthfully presented in a book now, alas! too little read, *The Gifts of Civilization*, by R. W. Church, Dean of St. Paul's. There you will find neither pessimism nor gloom, nor feeble optimism and sentimentality, but a picture of civilization seen with the eyes of Christian faith; and in the present season of moral dejection and loss of ideals, our personal salvation and the salvation of society depend on our seeing that vision. You re-

member the scene in the *Pilgrim's Progress*, when Evangelist meets with Christian:

> 'Then said Evangelist, pointing with his finger over a very wide field, Do you see yonder wicket-gate? The man said, No. Then said the other, Do you see yonder shining light? He said, I think I do. Then said Evangelist, Keep that light in your eye, and go up directly thereto.'

Professor McDougall, in his little book on *National Welfare*, writes:

> 'One factor alone can secure our future and save us as a people from the fatal decline, and may even secure for us a continued progress in all that makes the worth of human living.
>
> 'It is the increasing knowledge of human nature and of human society, and of the conditions that make for or against the flourishing of human nature and society. . . . Fortunately, there is widely diffused a belief in the value of science and of its application to human life. Many keen workers are adding to the sum of knowledge, and we are learning to be guided by it. Therein lies our hope for the future' (p. 174).

I am sure I do believe in the value of science as a factor in bringing in the Kingdom of God on earth—a very important factor—but unless science can be united to the Vision of God—and it must be God as unveiled in Christ, seen in Christ's love and sacrifice—it cannot prevail to save human society; and the Vision of God—although many of our scientists have had it—was not the gift of science unless we extend the meaning of that term much beyond what it usually includes.

There is something which takes place within us which Plato called the turning of the soul towards the light: that is the first step towards the coming of the Kingdom of God, first in ourselves and then in the world. The dialogue of Jesus with Nicodemus in the Fourth Gospel emphasizes this:

> 'Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born again (or *from above*) he cannot see the Kingdom of God. . . . Marvel not that I said unto thee, Ye must be born again (or *from above*)' (iii, 3, 8).

The late Professor Henry Drummond commented thus on these words, and I wish to conclude with his comment, for it suggests a vital question addressed to each one of us, which makes the coming of the Kingdom of God a personal matter:

> '*Marvel not that I said unto thee, Ye must be born again.* Marvel not as though it were incredible: marvel not as though it were impossible: marvel not as though it were unnecessary: that ye must be born again—but marvel if you are: marvel if you are not: marvel that it may be to-day.'

SOME REFLECTIONS ON ENGLISH POETRY AND THE WAR

By H. G. Mulliner, B.A., Hertford College, Oxford.

I.

HEROIC verse has from all time been associated with the art of war. Mr. Binyon writes in *Oxford in War Time*:

> 'But immortal verse
> Is now exchanged for its immortal theme,
> Victory; proud loss; and the enduring mind.'

As it ever has been so it was in the late war; but only in a few minds and they the less remarkable, and only for a short time and that at the beginning. Rupert Brooke will at once occur to all as an example of this, and especially those great lines commencing:

> 'Now God be thanked who matched us with this hour
> And caught our manhood and wakened us from sleeping.'

and the fine sentiment of *The Soldier*:

> 'If I should die think only this of me:
> That there's some corner of a foreign field
> That is for ever England.'

No one else expressed so well the spirit of August, 1914, as it was felt by those many in whom patriotism had not died and in whom fear had not brought disillusionment. In the same key there are the gentle lyrics of farewell, such as W. N. Hodgson's *Ave, Mater, atque vale* addressed to England, and Mr. Nichol's *Farewell to a place of comfort.* This is the last verse of that poem:

> 'O bronzen pines, evenings of gold and blue,
> Steep mellow slope, brimmed twilit pools below,
> Hushed trees, still vale dissolving in the dew,
> Farewell! Farewell! There is no more to do.
> We have been happy. Happy now I go.'

Grenfell and Hodgson carried the same spirit to France. The former's *Into Battle* contains much that is beautiful. Take these two verses:

> 'The blackbird sings to him, "Brother, brother,
> If this be the last song you shall sing,
> Sing well, for you may not sing another,
> Brother, sing."'
>
> In dreary, doubtful, waiting hours,
> Before the brazen frenzy starts,
> The horses show him nobler powers;
> O patient eyes, courageous hearts.'

Hodgson in *Back to Rest* is unique in writing:

'Now when the fight is ended
We know that it was good.'

Only in the early days of the war was the idealism of the poet sufficient to produce such a thought. More typical are such poems as Tennant's *Home Thoughts from Laventie*, which sang of the countryside left behind. The first poem from the front in *The Times* has such a subject. These poets stand alone. They are amongst those to whom the war brought immediate action. They do not stop, even if they cared, to sing of Right, Liberty, Honour, or of political themes. The subjects are as personal to the poets as their methods of treating them. Their poetry is heroic, charming, sometimes beautiful. There is nothing striking in its form or original in its technique. What distinguishes it from so much of the third-rate verse is its mastery of words, its simplicity, its sincerity and refinement of sentiment.

The war aroused patriotism and patriotism produced poetry. The files of *The Times* for the first six months of the war give very varied examples of this early patriotic verse. On the whole, it may be said not unkindly, that such verse was inevitable, and shows it. They are poems, not of reflection but of emotion, both personal and national. Even on August 6th the hate of the Kaiser and the purity of England was a poet's theme. But in some there is a higher inspiration. Sir Henry Newbolt sang of the war as he sang of Clifton. He represents the flower of that fine idealism which is to be found in our maligned public schools. He assumes that idealism, portrays it, and appeals to it as Mr. Kipling often appeals to the simpler sentiments of Britishers. This is seen in the last verse of Newbolt's beautiful poem, *The Vigil*, published on August 5th:

'So shalt thou when morning comes
Rise to conquer or to fall,
Joyful hear the rolling drums,
Joyful hear the trumpets call.

Then let Memory tell thy heart;
"*England! what thou wert, thou art!*"
Gird thee with thine ancient might,
Forth! and God defend the Right!'

Whether intentionally or not it seems nearly identical in spirit with the famous picture with the same title. It is indeed

Victorian, but it is the product of sincere faith in the ideals of the great Victorians.

> 'Drink to our fathers who begot us men,
> To the dead voices that are never dumb;
> Then to the land of all our loves, and then
> To the long parting, and the age to come.'

There is perhaps little finer of its 'artistic kind' than his *Volunteer*, which is so much truer to the spirit of the day than Herbert Asquith's more stately and detached poem.

Similar to these poems, though less vigorous in style, are those of Mr. Noyes. Mr. Kipling contributed *For All We Have and Are*. In common with the other writers of this class he appeals to the moral ideals of the public, but there is also in his writings a critical vein which he shares with the realists. In *Mesopotamia, 1917*, and in some of his *Epitaphs* he turns against the authorities whose slothfulness left to die 'the eager and whole hearted whom we gave.' In *Natural Theology* he turns again on those who blame God for a war, inevitable in a society which spends money on armies and fleets. Generally Mr. Kipling appeals to reason and sentiment rather than to emotion. In some of his *Epitaphs* there is a bitter realism similar to Mr. Sassoon's:

> 'If any mourn us in the workshop, say
> We died because the shift kept holiday.'

There were many poems in *The Times* dealing with political themes. Many were addressed to our Allies. Lines such as 'Reveals within her milk-white breast, the blood-red heart of war,' in *Heart of Italy*, are barely commendable, and it is felt that only political reasons could justify such international courtesies in bad verse. To the Empire there are many poems. Indian soldiers are exhorted 'Into their hearts, my brothers, drive home, drive home the steel'!

The Public School man and, above all, the home folk, might accept with gladness the refined idealism of Sir Henry Newbolt. But it was another matter when one writer published some *Marching Songs* for soldiers. One of them, to the tune of *John Brown's Body*, has this third verse:

> 'The shrines of God Almighty are shattered with shells; (*ter*)
> But the Kaiser's got to pay.
> *Chorus*: Glory, Glory, Hallelujah' (*ter*).

It can be agreed that they were 'in the simplest words,' but it cannot be agreed with *The Times* leader that 'if the soldiers choose to sing them they are well worthy of the honour.' In fact, as a correspondent pointed out, what the troops were really singing was:

'Send out the Army and the Navy,
Send out the rank and file,
(Have a banana.)
Send out the brave Territorials,
They easily can run a mile.
(I don't think.)
Send out the boys of the girls' brigade,
They will keep old England free;
Send out my mother, my sister, and my brother,
But for goodness' sake don't send me.'

To this age it seems undoubtedly true, as the same leader pointed out, that 'a joke in the face of death is something finer than a heroic attitude, and we believe a joke can be kept up longer than the attitude.'

Between the ordinary soldier refusing the heroics, which some would have given him to sing, in emulation of *Deutschland über Alles*, and the realist poet profoundly distrusting all Victorian (*sic*) idealism, there is something in common. There is the same fear of cant phrases and of their hardening effect, and further, there is a sense of the inadequacy of the words to express his understanding of life, and a lurking suspicion that they are not too closely related to the real facts. As for the spirit of hate with which some would have inspired him, he ignored it:

'Oh, oh, oh, it's a lovely war;
. . . . . .
What do you want with eggs and 'am,
When you've got plum and apple jam. . . .'

Food was more interesting than hate. Besides, he had with his foes a community in suffering and obedience. And so Sorley, though it is probably an early poem:

'When it is peace, then we may view again
With new-won eyes each other's truer form
And wonder. Grown more loving-kind and warm
We'll grasp firm hands and laugh at the old pain,
When it is peace. But until peace, the storm
The darkness and the thunder and the rain.'

II.

Turning to the younger poets, the transition to the realistic school can be made by considering the poems of Mr. Geoffrey Dearmer. He went out to Gallipoli, and very early in *From 'W' Beach*, he wrote this:

'Celestial Gardeners speed the hurrying day
And sow the plains of night with silver grain,
So shall this transient havoc fade away
And the proud cape be beautiful again.'

But later he wrote a poem, *The Dead Turk*:

'Dead, dead and dumbly chill. He seemed to lie
Carved from the earth, in beauty without stain.
And suddenly
Day turned to night, and I beheld again
A still centurion with eyes ablaze
And Calvary re-echoed with his cry—
His cry of stark amaze.'

If we mistake not, the first belief in the transiency of war's effect gave place to a sense of the incomprehensible wrong of war. Dearmer is a lover of Keats, as the style of the first quotation may suggest. Yet like most moderns he fears above all what he called 'tattered sentiment.' The war palls on him in its horror. He feels acutely with the pain of others, and yet he seeks the beautiful within it all. It is this conflict which makes much of his poetry live, and it is to be found most attractively in his *Turkish Trench Dog*. In his *Sentinel* he turned to portray the psychology of being under fire, and it is significant that while he describes the fear of one man, the sentinel, like the sentinel of Pompeii, remains immovable, the symbol of strength and triumph. The object of the war-poet is, in his words, to 'conjure heaven from the surrounding hell.' So he attempts, but his poems have more pathos than joy. What he can never forget is:

'the iron bitterness and keen
Of voices ever clamouring farewell.'

It is not surprising, then, that there were others to whom the portrayal of the realities of war, its pity and its horror, seemed more the poet's task.

'For we are poets
And shall tell the truth.'

as one wrote in a bitter poem. But best of all has this been expressed by the greatest of these poets, Wilfrid Owen. In

his *Apologia pro poemate meo* he writes of seeing God through mud, of the laughter, and the fellowship, and the beauty, present even in France, and then he concludes:

'Nevertheless except you share
With them the sorrowful dark of hell,
Whose world is but the trembling of a flare,
And heaven but as the highway of a shell,
You shall not hear their mirth.
You shall not come to think them well content
By any jest of mine. These men are worth
Your tears; you are not worth their merriment.'

How great is the change in method and style between the poets of to-day and those of yesterday will be appreciated if we contrast two passages; one an extract from Byron's *Bride of Abydos* and the other Cameron Wilson's poem *A Soldier*. Selim is shot dead in the presence of his beloved just as he is about to escape in a boat; and this is how Byron portrays it:

'There as his last step left the land
And the last death blow dealt his hand—
Ah, wherefore did he pause to look
For her, his eyes but sought in vain?
That pause, that fatal gaze he took,
Hath doom'd his death or fix'd his chain.
Sad proof in peril or in pain
How late will lovers' hope remain!
His back was to the splashing spray;
Behind but close his comrades lay,
When at the instant hissed the ball—
'So may the foe of Giaffir fall!'
Whose voice is heard? Whose carbine rang?
Whose bullet through the night air sang,
Too nearly, deadly aimed to err?
"'Tis thine—Abdulla's murderer!"'

Wilson's *A Soldier*:

'He laughed. His blue eyes searched the morning,
Found the unceasing song of the lark
In a brown twinkle of wings, far out.
Great clouds, like galleons, sailed the distance.
The young spring day had slipped the cloak of dark
And stood straight up and naked with a shout.
Through the green wheat like laughing schoolboys,
Tumbled together the yellow mustard flowers unchecked.
The wet earth reeked and smoked in the sun. . . .
He thought of the waking farm in England.
The deep thatch of the roof—all shadow fleck'd—
The clank of pails at the pump . . . the day begun.
"After the war . . . ." he thought. His heart beat faster
With a new love for things familiar and plain.
The Spring leaned down and whispered to him low
Of a slim brown-throated woman he had kissed . . .

He saw in sons which were himself again
The only immortality that man may know.

And then a sound grew out of the morning
And a shell came moving a destined way,
Thin and swift and lustful, making its moan.
A moment his brave white body knew the Spring,
The next, it lay
In a red ruin of blood and guts and bone.

. . . . . .

Oh nothing was tortured there. Nothing could know
How death blasphemed all men and their high birth
With his obscenities. Already moved
Within those shattered tissues, that dim force,
Which is the ancient alchemy of Earth,
Changing him to the very flowers he loved.

. . . . . .

'Nothing was tortured there.' Oh, pretty thought!
When God Himself might well bow down His head
And hide His haunted eyes before the dead.'

The difference between these two poems is obvious. The restrained rhythm, the sober metre of Wilson fits his theme. The rhetorical questions and moral asides of Byron jar. What Wilson loses in the formlessness of his poetic thought, he seems to overcome by emotional unity and balance.

But in Mr. Gibson's poems the use of contrast (so prominent in *A Soldier*) gives way to simple narration. *The Bayonet* is an example of an extreme type:

'This bloody steel
Has killed a man.
I heard him squeal
As on I ran.

'He watched me come
With wagging head.
I pressed it home
And he was dead.

'Though clean and clear
I've wiped the steel,
I still can hear
That dying squeal.'

And *Mad*:

'Neck deep in mud
He mowed and raved—
He who had braved
The field of blood—

And as a lad
Just out of school
Yelled "April Fool!"
And laughed like mad.'

It is to be noted in these two poems that the metre, rhyme, and rhythm are perfectly straightforward. The words are colourless and description is restrained. Despite their subjects they are very short. There is not the slightest emotional significance. And if realism must, as I hold it must, include the emotional content of a scene, then these poems can only be called realistic in a limited sense. At times they seem to be bathos. But whether that bathos is in the poem itself or is the result of the mental make-up of the reader, which would naturally inhibit the visualisation of so repellent an incident—this is a question which it is hard to answer. But they are remarkable poems regarded historically because they are clearly the product of that mind of unfeeling realism which was acquired by so many in France. Either acquired because self-interest killed pity, or as with Mr. Gibson, because the pity was so great that no words could adequately express it—a point worked out in Owen's *Insensibility*.

There is a poem, *Break of Day*, by Mr. Sassoon which is suggestive. He describes a soldier, trying to sleep in a trench and waking to remember :

> 'Zero's at nine; how bloody if I'm done in
> Under the freedom of that morning sky!'

He sleeps again and dreams of England, of a Sussex lane, of a hunt in the Big Wood; the old horse 'stretches down his neck to crop the green.' And then asterisks and a concluding line, 'Hark! there's the horn: they're drawing the big wood.' The antithesis is marked clearly between the life in the trenches and at home, but where one expects a synthesis there are asterisks. In other poems of this school one finds the same unresolved antithesis and contentment to describe conflict. Asterisks are the confession and the symbol of this failure to achieve a synthesis.

As Mr. Sassoon's *Counter Attack* is more detached and less introspective than Mr. Nichol's *Assault*, so Wilfred Owen in the *Strange Meeting* is more detached than either. It is the most remarkable of all our War poems. He pictures himself meeting the man he has killed; the dead man speaks to him as one who has shared his profoundest ideals for humanity; and from within the setting of war the poem rises to conceptions that transcend it. Owens' other poems include *The Sentry*, *Dead Beat*.

Mental Cases, *Disabled*, and will by their titles give some indication of the trend of the poet's thought. With much strength and delicacy of feeling and an original use of consonantal rhymes, he achieves poems of great attraction and possibly of lasting worth. These poems are marked by an emotional unity.

What has been written in this article will indicate the kind of poetry life on the battlefield inspired. My next article will deal with the real attitude to the war of those poets who fought in it.

BOOK NOTICES

GENESIS AND THE CHINESE*

The work of the Bible Society in China is invaluable. In its absence missionaries would be crippled and the Chinese Church be without its Book, or, on the other hand, there would be as many different versions as there are denominations at work. For good or for ill, by their constitutions the Bible Societies may only issue their excellent versions without note or comment. This enables Christians of varying, even antagonistic views, to co-operate harmoniously in the preparation and distribution of the Scriptures, but like all compromises it has disadvantages. In this instance it means that portions of the Old and New Testaments are distributed amongst a people who have neither our tradition nor our perspective, and who may therefore obtain inaccurate ideas of our religion. The Bible Society does its duty in the Mission Field admirably, but its work needs supplementing by others who have greater freedom.

Take for instance the book of Genesis, which is disseminated by the thousand in China. Here we have a book which, read by a modern Chinese student, may very easily make him an enemy of our Faith, on the ground that the scientific knowledge of to-day controverts the truth of its statements. The Creation, the making of Adam and Eve, the Tower of Babel, the Flood and so on—these fascinating stories are pictures to us portraying God. To a modern educated Chinese, who never has our background and traditional sympathy, it is not God who is visible in the picture, but a series of false notions.

Bishop Norris, of the S.P.G., Peking, has just issued in Chinese, a useful Introduction to Genesis i—xi, adapted from *The Early Narratives of Genesis*, by the Rt. Rev. H. E. Ryle, D.D. Its purpose is to show the educated Chinese what is the modern Christian attitude towards these chapters. His preface says:

> 'This little book is an attempt to make the early chapters of Genesis really helpful, and yet not misleading to Chinese readers. The book of Genesis is one of the most widely circulated 'portions' issued by the Bible Societies, presumably on the ground that it gives a true and accurate account of the 'beginning' of the world and of the human race. Circulated as it is without note or comment, I cannot but feel that it will constitute a grave danger to the Church of the future, unless we try to set it in its true light, as containing Hebrew tradi-

[1] Published by the S.P.C.K., price 10 cents.

tions, selected and preserved under the guidance of God's Holy Spirit, because—in this form—they had a lesson of the highest value for the Jewish race and for all mankind.

'That the "conflict of science and religion" should have taken place in the West was inevitable, because "religion" was crystallised by centuries of "literal interpretation," if not of "verbal inspiration theory," when the science of the nineteenth century came into existence. The results of that conflict were often deplorable; they would have been far worse but for the firm hold that had been taken during centuries of faith by the deeper truths that underlay "religion." The same conflict need never—at least in the old form—take place in China, if teachers are wise. But if they are not, it will not only take place and that soon, but its results in young Churches full of recent converts will surely be dangerous indeed. Bishop Ryle in the preface to his little book wrote thus: "The old position is no longer tenable. A new position has to be taken up at once, prayerfully chosen and hopefully held." If that was true twenty-five years ago in England, it is doubly true to-day in China, where the apparent possibility of holding the old position for a few more years is more than outweighed by the present opportunity for taking up the new position, "prayerfully chosen," and to be "hopefully held."'

Amongst the young Christians of China are many who have been brought up in the modern interpretation, but who are constantly meeting on the one hand, with the hostile criticism of educated non-Christians, and, on the other, with the hostility of missionaries and Christians of the older school. To such as these Bishop Norris's book should be especially welcome. More such works are needed and no doubt will soon be produced by the fine body of scholarly young missionaries and educated young Chinese who are rapidly undertaking larger responsibilities in the Church.

W. E. Soothill.

EARLY CHRISTIANITY.*

The first volume of this gigantic work was reviewed by Mr. Creed in this magazine in December, 1920. The second volume is, in my opinion, more valuable than the first. The editors have been assisted by such eminent authorities as Mr. Cadbury, Mr. Emmet and Professor Burkitt. A composite work like this lacks the completeness and rotundity of a great book by a single author. There is a want of proportion, and also lacunae and inconsistencies. But it has the advantage that each section is by a specially qualified writer, and various views can be set forth in succession and placed side by side.

The first chapter, on Greek and Jewish methods of writing history, is fundamental. One wishes it could have been even more complete than it is, for there is, in English, no really thorough and satisfactory treatment of the subject, though Professor Bury's work on the Greek historians is valuable. Until we know the purpose of a writer, and what literary traditions he follows, we read him with half-shut eyes. There is much in this volume in regard to the purpose of the writer of *Acts*, but perhaps sufficient stress is hardly laid on the consideration that the purpose of a writer may be quite unconscious. Whether he puts on coloured spectacles or not, he yet sees everything in a light of his own.

In Professor Burkitt's chapter on the use of Mark in the Gospel of Luke, we again touch bed-rock. For as Luke treats Mark's narrative,

* *The Beginnings of Christianity · Part I, The Acts of the Apostles.* By F. J. Foakes Jackson and Kirsopp Lake. Vol. II, *Prolegomena and Criticism.* (Macmillan and Co.)

which he had before him, so he is likely to treat other documents. But Luke is elusive. He has so much literary skill, in addition to the dramatic power which strikes every reader, that he constantly baffles the critic. A clear result which Mr. Burkitt reaches is that it is difficult, or even impossible, to get beyond Luke to his sources by a mere analysis of his narrative. Some critics have a way of thinking that when a narrative is flat and pointless it is untrustworthy; but Mr. Burkitt is nearer the mark when he points out that these qualities are just what may be expected in a spectator's reminiscences. The point of a tale is very often contributed by literary skill.

The question whether Luke, the friend of St. Paul, is the author of *Acts* is discussed from both sides, and at great length. Most readers will consider that 'the ayes have it.' Undue stress is sometimes laid on an argument, on the other side, that the author often misunderstands St. Paul, and very imperfectly appreciates him. The fact seems to be that the two men were of very different characters; and however much Luke may have admired his great friend, he could not fathom his depths. He certainly was no Boswell.

To English and American readers one of the most interesting chapters will be Mr. Hunkin's on British work on the *Acts*. The writer sets forth with much clearness and learning the merits of a great succession of English writers, from Dean Colet to Bishop Lightfoot, who have dealt with the subject. Their books shew little of the brilliant theorizing of the great German critics, but they are marked by sound judgement and wise caution. Much of their work has a permanent value. In one field, that of archæological illustration, they have been especially active and useful. Lewin, Howson, James Smith and especially Ramsay, have done much to make the background of the drama of St. Paul's life clear to us. This laborious and illuminative toil ought never to be overlooked.

In an appendix are considered two literary analogies, the story of St. Francis of Assisi, by Mr. G. G. Coulton; and the story of Margaret Catchpole, by the Editors. In 1889 I inserted in *Exploratio Evangelica* a long note (pp. 174—6) on the parallel between the Gospel story and that of St. Francis. I am glad that Mr. Coulton has worked out this most instructive analogy in more detail, and with far greater knowledge of mediæval life. But I think we might have dispensed with Margaret Catchpole, who really helps us very little, and brings in a heap of irrevelant matter. It is a pity that the learned editors did not, instead, give a brief summary of the most illuminating work of Dr. Edwin Abbott on the Miracles of St. Thomas of Canterbury. This would have been far nearer to the point.

This great introduction to the book of *Acts* will certainly be of much value in theological colleges and to the educated English and American laity (are they diminishing in number?) who are deeply interested in the origins of the Christian religion. Though the authors write in America, they were brought up among us, and they do not give way to the prevalent American (and Scottish) notion, *e Germania sola lux*. P. GARDNER.

THE GOSPEL OF THE MANHOOD.*

Dr. Skrine's book may perhaps best be regarded as an expansion of, and commentary upon a great sentence of Dr. R. C. Moberly's: 'He (Christ) is, then, not so much God *and* man, as God in, and through, and as man.' (*Atonement and Personality*, p. 96.) We are to learn the Divi-

* *The Gospel of the Manhood*. By JOHN HUNTLEY SKRINE, D.D. (Skeffington, 1922. Price 5/- net.)

nity of Christ by a study of his Humanity, and there is no other way. 'Masked words in lieu of truth' will not help us, and those who pin their faith to the formula: 'Jesus Christ is the Son of God' are challenged to think out and explain to others the implications of their creed.

The words attributed to the risen Christ at the close of the first Gospel: 'Lo! I am with you all the days,' are to be regarded as no mere rhetorical expression of Christian experience, but as the very pith and marrow of a true faith. Jesus of Nazareth was not brought to nothingness by death. Unless He who became a man has not remained a man, Christ can profit us nothing. The Gospel of the Manhood is the good news, received, welcomed, and acted upon, that it is with a Man that we have to do. 'His human heart is not gone from Him, but contrariwise has widened to the compass of all human hearts.' He is the same yesterday, to-day and for ever, or rather, different only in this, that the range of His influence as a Man is now one with the boundless sweep of the activity of God. 'The human becomes infinite—is not this the Divine?'

Dr. Skrine shews throughout the scholar's passion for reality. He will probe a dogma relentlessly in order to reach the fundamental truth which justified its formulation. And that fundamental truth, to be truth, must be capable of adequate expression in the simplest terms, and must find a spontaneous response in the life experience of the ordinary Christian. We speak readily enough of the dogma of our Lord's sinlessness. But the conception is negative and therefore lacking in dynamic effect. Say rather: 'Christ is the Living One,' the transmitter of divine life to men, and then test the truth of every doctrine, the worth of every institution, by the measure in which the doctrine or the institution serves as a vehicle for that life's transmission. This is the author's own method. He will have us think of the Atonement as the inflowing of the divine life of Jesus into the lives of those whom He seeks to save, since in the last resort life and At-onement, or fellowship with God, are interchangeable terms.

So, too, the Resurrection is important, primarily for this, that it re-established personal, life-giving intercourse between Jesus and His friends. But what was the essential character of this empowering fellowship between Master and disciple, and by what means was it maintained? In seeking an answer to this question, Dr. Skrine makes use of a modern terminology, and adduces the phenomena of telepathy, or to use his own word, 'Thought-conference,' as helpful towards a right interpretation of Christian experience. The truth of central importance is that the mind and thoughts of Jesus of Nazareth are as much at the disposal of the twentieth century Christians as of Peter and John, and that his method of communication with us to-day is essentially unchanged. The Christian doctrine of the Holy Spirit is valuable only as it expresses unflinchingly the truth of the Abiding Manhood. The Lord *is* the Spirit. The Spirit who directs, controls, empowers, is the Spirit of Jesus. Unless that be recognised the Gospel of the Manhood will fail of its full effect.

But what bearing has this Gospel of the Manhood, this doctrine of a life-imparting, human Christ upon the pressing problems of the day? What are the true principles of reconstruction, whether of Creed or Church, what the rightful terms of reunion, what the means whereby the saving truth of Christianity can be brought home to those we call the masses? In approaching these problems, Dr. Skrine applies his main principles with dauntless consistency. The truth of a creed may be tested by the measure in which it serves as an instrument of life to those who hold it. The work of a church may be judged by its ability to create the life of Christ in its adherents, and the ultimate test of a church's right to the name is found

not in the form of its government nor the formal correctness of its creed, but rather in the nature of its fellowship with the living Christ.

To this living Christ, who is vitally concerned with all our problems, every question must be referred. Certainly it is the Christian way, and nothing is beyond the scope of His interest. If women seek the priesthood, the appeal is not to tradition but to Christ, 'a Christ greater than the Christ of Galilean days.' He it is with whom we have to do, and He it is —this Jesus not of long ago but of now—who can 'speak to the condition' of the ordinary man. Our doctrine must not be divorced from experience. Framers of philosophic systems may be few, but the simple and unlearned 'is philosopher enough to be unable to think a doctrine which cannot make its way into the little circle of ideas which is his narrow knowledge of the world he lives in.' Here is a challenge offered to Modernist and Traditionalist alike, and we shall agree that Dr. Skrine is right in his assertion that in the Gospel of the Manhood we have that which may carry conviction to all sorts and conditions of men. The book is an appeal to the Church to think 'growing thoughts of God and man,' to discard the all too common attitude of 'woodenness' in face of new needs, to realise that it is less 'the steadfastness than the adventurousness of faith' which is the demand of our day, and, above all, to discover and fearlessly to proclaim a doctrine of Christ life-giving for both mind and will. W.M.P.

AN AMBIGUOUS MANIFESTO*

This collection of essays with an Introduction by Bishop Gore and an Epilogue by Mr. G. K. Chesterton is an interesting sign of the times. Christian socialism, it would appear, is raising its head again after the slump in idealism which we have experienced since the war. Bishop Gore outlines the social philosophy of the writers when he says:

> 'They hold that our present industrial society rests upon a rotten foundation; and that what is needed to remedy the manifest "sickness" of our "Acquisitive Society" is something much more than particular social reforms. There is needed the substitution of a true idea or principle of Society—that is of Socialism in some sense—for the false' (p. 9).

The 'rotten foundation' above alluded to is likely to have a considerable lease of life, however, being what it is, *i.e.* ungenerate human nature. Probably where the idealists err is in their lack of psychological insight; the majority of men are not rational, still less *doctrinaire*. Nevertheless, it is well to have ideals formulated.

Mr. Widdrington, whose essay seems to us the best thing in the book, finds in the old conception of the Kingdom of God a sufficient formulation of the spiritual, moral, and social ideal. It has to be admitted that the phrase is ceasing to mean much to the plain citizen: to him it seems like one of those hallowed yet commercially worthless pieces of currency which the Musical-Bank-Managers were in the habit of passing on the Erewhonian public.

Mr. Widdrington makes a vigorous attempt to bring the idea back into the sphere of realities, reminds us of its history in the past, and emphasises its necessity for the present if we are to emerge from the difficulties, ethical, social, and religious, which surround us. Being translated into necessarily general language, the idea now signifies that 'Christian living postulates the background of a common life in which Christian values are embodied' (p. 92). In other words the days of individualism

* *The Return of Christendom.* By a Group of Churchmen. (Allen and Unwin; 7/6 net.)

in religion are past, for if religion cannot work a fundamental change in our social and economic environment, that environment will eliminate religion.

There seems to be need of nothing less than another Reformation 'in comparison with which the Reformation of the sixteenth century will seem a small thing (p. 108); and a revised theology of the Kingdom would purge the Church of that plausible insincerity which masquerades as 'spiritual religion' (p. 110). We read, too, in a footnote (p. 95) that it will 'purge the Church of associations with the modern equivalents of Mystery Cults, Neo-Platonism, &c.'

We do not anticipate that observations of this kind will render the new propaganda attractive in those circles to which the term 'catholic' is commonly attached, and possibly it may have been with the idea of reconciling pietistic readers to the somewhat uncompromising utterances of Mr. Widdrington that two or three essays of a more palatable nature have been included in this collection. The Rev. L. S. Thornton, and the Rev. Paul Bull, write respectively on 'The Necessity of Catholic Dogma,' and 'The Kingdom of God and the Church to-day.' Mr. H. H. Slessor, too, contributes an essay with the reassuring title: 'The Return of Dogma.'

At the same time, while fully appreciating the quality of these contributions and the motives which included them, we cannot but doubt the wisdom of mixing up the sheep and the goats in this way. As it stands, this volume will meet with little unqualified approbation. One section of the religious public will be scandalised by Mr. Widdrington's candid polemic, while another section will wonder whether it is not being led back into the theological labyrinth when it reads passages like the following from Mr. Thornton:

> 'Nature had failed; nothing could help it but a new creative act of God, or rather a series of acts unmistakably supernatural in character. So the Son of God became Man and was born of a Virgin, worked miracles upon earth, lived and died and rose from the dead, taking again His body and ascending into heaven. So, too, on the basis of these redemptive acts He instituted the Catholic Church, pouring His Spirit into it and so creating in it a new centre of world-wide fellowship' (p. 71).

We cannot but feel that a new 'Kingdom of God' theology (if we may be allowed the term), while resisting the temptation to indulge in negations, would be well-advised to lay down its rule of faith in other terms than these outlined by Mr. Thornton. If the New Reformation is to follow its sixteenth-century predecessor in burdening itself with a mass of disputable history and antiquated philosophy, its effectiveness as a spiritual force is likely to be compromised. We urge these reflections upon Mr. Widdrington and those who think with him.

In closing this notice we desire to commend the two admirable essays of Mr. Reckitt on 'The Moralization of Property' and 'The Idea of Christendom in Relation to Modern Society.' J. C. H.

A MUCH-NEEDED BOOK.*

Those who have had anything to do with schoolboys or remember their own schooldays, will be aware of the strange gaps in the body of historical information possessed by the more or less intelligent adolescent. A certain amount of Greek and Roman history (nothing of course of the decline and

* *A Short History of our Religion*, by D. C. Somervell. (Bell and Sons; 6/- net.)

fall of the Roman Empire), some scraps of Hebrew mythology and history, some slight knowledge of mediaeval England (none of mediaeval Europe), and a rather more comprehensive acquaintance with the Stuart and Hanoverian periods. These fragments co-exist in a more or less disconnected fashion, and thus profit little, or less than they ought.

Mr. Somervell, who is himself a schoolmaster, does not attempt to supply us with an universal history; but in something over three hundred pages he gives us a history of Christianity from its pre-natal origins among the Hebrews and Greeks, down to the present day. The work strikes us as being extraordinarily well done. The style is lively, the matter interesting, and a plain tale is told without pedantry, without obscurity, and, we may add, without obscurantism. The book, too, is remarkably comprehensive; a glance at the eighteen-page index, which is almost entirely composed of names of persons, indicates the scope of the volume. Here the fascinated schoolboy or schoolgirl will read about that neglected period between the Old and New Testaments, about the foundation of the Holy Roman Empire and the first dawn after the night of the dark ages, about those bold mediaeval thinkers, like Abelard and Anselm, who created the Scholastic theology, about Loyola and his *Spiritual Exercises*, and so on; and, above all, they will learn something of the history of ideas, not to speak of the history of institutions.

An additional advantage is that the book is very cheap; 6/- now-a-days is a small price to pay for so much material. We can only hope that the sales will equal the merit of this admirable work. J. C. H.

WHOLESOME WORDS.*

These six short lectures contain much excellent matter. Theirs is that spiritual and yet rational temper which characterises, or used to characterise, English religion—the temper of the Cambridge Platonists so widely sundered from both superstition and legalism. Whichcote or John Smith might have written the following:

> 'Things have their highest value in so far as they are symbols of something beyond, which we feel to be our true home, and where lies at once our source and our destiny . . .Religion is the turning our face to the light, where we behold a world infinite in value, infinite in glory, infinite in life, to which the path leads from our own inner self' (p. 14).

Besides passages such as the above, many striking sayings occur:

> 'It is the life that is maintaining a lie that grows old and weary' (p. 10).
>
> 'We reach the highest note of praise in 'We thank Thee for Thy great glory' (p. 63).
>
> 'We lose the condition of knowledge just as we become knowing' (p. 17).
>
> 'The Jew who has enriched the world is not Solomon in all his glory' (p. 58).
>
> 'The humanity of Christ, where it was not marvellous, was treated as a disguise rather than a revelation' (p. 19).

We have noted one passage where we think Mr. Simms is liable to be misunderstood. He says (p. 11) that the danger of 'identifying God with something less than the highest' is one to which 'the uncritical and

* *Christianity To-day.* By the Rev. A. E. N. Simms. (Griffiths; 3/- net.)

unlearned' are specially exposed. No doubt there is a truth here. Yet, on the other hand, it is not the critical and unlearned who are the most sure of escaping this danger. As St. Anselm said, 'there is many an old woman who knows more of the love of God than do the theologians.' Spinoza, too, that religious genius, told his pious landlady at the Hague that if she sought God in her own way she would find Him. 'Blessed are the unsophisticated, for they shall know God,' might be another beatitude.

J. C. H.

READINGS FROM THE APOCRYPHA. By E. H. Blakeney, M.A. (Texts for Students, No. 28). London, S.P.C.K. Price, 1/- paper covers; 1/6 cloth boards.

This volume contains about fifty representative pieces selected from the Apocrypha, with a brief historical introduction, notes, and index. The text is eclectic: while it is based on the A.V., it has been changed in a good number of places, wherever the old translations were plainly at fault. The book is handsomely printed, in large type, and can easily be slipped into the pocket.

CORRESPONDENCE

THE LORD OF THOUGHT.

TO THE EDITOR OF *The Modern Churchman.*

SIR,

May I be allowed one word of comment on the excellent review of *The Lord of Thought* in your last issue? Mr. Pryke finds the main objection to the theory that Christ rejected the Apocalyptic outlook in the saying, 'of that day or that hour knoweth no one,' &c. I agree with him that the saying is authentic, but if he will look again at my discussion of Mark xiii he will find the suggestion that *originally* these words applied to the fall of Jerusalem, though of course in their present setting they refer to the *Parousia.* The question asked of Christ (according to Mark and Luke) had to do with the destruction of the Temple, and the original elements in the discourse (including the words quoted by Mr. Pryke) may be held to have been solely an answer to this question. In subsequent tradition additions were made which turned it into a prediction of a Second Coming of the Son of Man.

C. W. EMMET.

THE OTHER SIDE OF HINDUISM.

SIR,

In Mr. Greaves's paper on 'Hinduism,' which appears in this year's Oxford Conference Number of the *Modern Churchman,* there is one sentence which seems to me to merit careful attention. He writes:

> 'Speaking broadly, Hindus are often about as far in advance of the Hinduism they profess as are nominal Christians behind the Christianity which they are supposed to obey.' (p. 410).

Now if this is true (and certainly my own experience, which during the last three years has brought me into daily contact with young Hindu students, confirms its truth), then it seems to me that this suggests that

there may be more of value in Hinduism than would be gathered from the general tone of Mr. Greaves' paper. For if the fruits of a religion, as seen in the lives of its adherents, are on the whole better than its tenets would lead us to expect, it may be that the explanation is, that these tenets have not been perfectly understood by us. Especially is this the case with a religion the fundamental axioms of which are so unfamiliar, not to say unthinkable, as those of Hinduism are to the normal Western mind. The sense of bewilderment, if not of repulsion, which is generally produced by our first contact with the ideas of Karma, Maya, Reincarnation, and the other corallaries of Oriental Pantheism is liable to deaden our powers of reasonable appreciation, and to pervert the fairness of our judgment.

Yet there are certainly many Christians, with a long and intimate knowledge of Hinduism, who, while by no means blind to its grievous defects and errors, yet show a much larger appreciation of its merits than is suggested in Mr. Greaves' article. I would venture to hope that your readers will not dismiss Hinduism as a mere valueless system of superstition until they have read some of the sympathetic (and yet discriminating) studies recently published, such as those by Mr. Sinclair Stevenson or Dr. Sydney Cave. The former, in 'The Rites of the Twice-Born' and 'The Heart of Jainism,' has given us two delightful pictures of Hinduism (and its cousin, Jainism) in daily life and worship; while the latter, in his 'Redemption, Hindu and Christian,' takes us with insight into the deeper realms of philosophy and theology. Both these writers (together with many others among Christian Missionaries) show that generous attitude towards non-Christian thought and experience, to which Dr. Percy Gardner referred with commendation in his Presidential Address at the Oxford Conference; an attitude which it ought to be the special privilege of Liberal Churchmen to safeguard and cherish.

And in the case of Hinduism, the warm appreciation which its sacred books have evoked from Western scholars and thinkers, such as Max Müller and Schopenhauer, Deussen and Royce, should surely suggest to every lesser student that here is a religion which he will do well to study, not only with sympathy, but with humility and respect.

E. C. DEWICK.

ST. PAUL'S COLLEGE,
CALCUTTA.
November 7th, 1922.

THE CHURCH IN THE WEST INDIES.

SIR,

I am sending you herewith a copy of the Pastoral Letter of the Bishops of our Province, and a copy of their Resolutions assembled in Synod. As these documents are, I imagine, typical utterances of missionary Bishops, I think it worth while to make some observations upon them from a Liberal standpoint.

The scope and subjects dealt with in the Pastoral—its narrowly confined range will come as something of a shock to the regular reader who has been studying the articles on Missionary Problems lately in the *Modern Churchman*,—or who has come fresh from this year's Conference. To use your own phrase, 'they do not know that things are shaken—and still paddle boats in ecclesiastical back-waters.' Their apparent busy preoccupation with diocesan problems, their ambiguous language and attention to ecclesiastical detail will deceive nobody. Did none of them recollect Archbishop Tait's words, written in 1877: 'I am some-

times dispirited by thinking how the energies of the Bishops and clergy, which might by God's blessing produce such great results, are wasted by being diverted to paltry and miserable questions . . . what might not the Church do if discarding . . . disputes about anise and cummin the clergy would place themselves at the Head of the Christian Progress of the Age.'

By what standard and test is this constitution of the Anglican Bishops of the West Indies, sent forth with authority after due consideration, to be judged and valued as giving helpful guidance for the times? I answer in the words of Dr. H. Rashdall (quoted in Review, *Modern Churchman*, May, 1922, p. 10; from *Jesus, Human and Divine,'* pp. 78-79).

> 'I do not hesitate to say that one of the greatest needs—perhaps the greatest need of the Church to-day is an improvement in the education of the clergy, and a changed attitude towards intellectual questions not only of the clergy but of the religious laity. Without that not all the devotion of the laborious parochial clergy, not all the subscriptions of the benevolent laity, &c.,—will avail to make the Church hold its own and do its work in the world of to-day.'

Having reflected upon these striking words the thoughtful man carefully reading the Pastoral Letter and resolutions will feel distinctly unhappy and disturbed. If he had an inside and first-hand knowledge of the leading problems that trouble and perplex the Dioceses of the West Indian Province he will be puzzled to assign a reason for the ominous silence upon so many of them. It may be paradoxical, but a later age will value these documents for their notable omissions. Thus there is no message of Christian leadership upon the Colour Problem which year by year is becoming a more intricate problem and further disturbing the counsels, peace, and good fellowship of the West Indian Church. Nothing is said as to the reasons, no doubt very good ones, which have prompted the almost universal though tacit abandonment of a coloured or native ministry. A Church that is responsible in some cases for five races of people, whose crying need is a distinctive Liturgy and Revised Services, has the alternative of having, if the Bishop in question approves, the 1549 Liturgy. And indeed reactionary thought is the basis for many of the conclusions and recommendations of the Bishops.

It has been said that the present Bishop of London does all his reading in his motor-car, but perhaps this is apocryphal; at all events some of the statements of the Bishops which amount only to assertions and therefore call for suspension of judgment—give one pause rather uneasily. They seem ignorant of Dr. Headlam's Bampton Lectures; they do not seem to know of the difference of opinion on 'The Relation of Baptism to Confirmation' between, for instance, Dr. Darwell Stone and Canon A. J. Mason; the New Psychology has not it appears reached them. Archdeacon Charles, it appears, has laboured in vain even to secure a hearing on the subject of Divorce. Everything is assumed and taken for granted though Bishop Gore and an authority like Professor G. H. Box, D.D., are unable to agree between themselves in a joint book on the subject.

The Bishops speak much of the Lambeth Conference. The Bishop of Durham, Dr. Henson, closes his book on *Anglicanism* (Macmillan, 1921) with a chapter on the Conference. His gaitered brethren from overseas may note that on p. 245 he says: 'Unanimity ceases to be morally impressive when it appears to be the result of calculating diplomacy.' With some dryness of tone he further adds (p. 246), 'A missionary Bishop has

to be chosen for reasons which have no special relevance to the case of a Bishop in England. Physical vigour and great ardour of devotion are indispensable in the one case; there are other qualities which might seem not less indispensable in the other. Zeal is rarely allied with learning, dispassionateness, and the love of justice. These, however, are the primary requisites, when such questions as those which engage the attention of Bishops in Conference are being discussed.'

A Caribbean Missionary.

[We regret that we have no space for the Pastoral and Resolutions. The following quotation from R. 13 will suggest that the Church in England is not so clericalist as some of her daughter churches:

'We do further declare that the conduct of public worship is committed by the constitution of the Church of Christ to the Bishop and his clergy, to whom in such matters the allegiance of all the faithful laity is due.' —Ed. *M.C.*]

UNITY IN CHINA.

Sir,

It is a great encouragement to us out here to see so much evidence of interest in missionary problems in the *Modern Churchman*. Since I sent you the article which appeared in the May issue, the National Christian Conference—representing practically all Protestant missionary bodies in China—has been held in Shanghai. This Conference is held every ten years and this is the first time that Chinese delegates have attended in equal numbers with foreign missionaries. Moreover, the Chairman of the Conference was a Chinese, Dr. C. Y. Cheng, the Chairman of the Chinese Home Missionary Society and Secretary of the 'China for Christ' movement.

The particular point of interest for us is the fact that an attempt was made to introduce for acceptance a doctrinal statement of a narrow and exclusive type, and that wiser counsels saved the harmony of the conference. The proceedings of the conference may be summed up as follows:

(*a*) Preparations were made for many months beforehand by appointing five 'Commissions' of investigation, which made their reports to the conference, these reports being adopted as resolutions.

(*b*) A resolution was adopted by rising vote and the singing of the Doxology, in place of the suggested doctrinal statement.

(*c*) A National Council of one hundred members—half Chinese and half foreign—was appointed, representing the following bodies: Anglican, Baptist, Congregational, Presbyterian, United Church, Lutheran, Methodist, China Inland Mission, Y.M.C.A., Y.W.C.A., Christian and Missionary Alliance, Independent Churches, Colleges, National Organisations, Literature Organisations, Others, General.

(*d*) A resolution on the subject of industrial questions was passed.

The spirit of the Conference was well expressed by Dr. Liu, of the L.M.S. in Peking, in the striking phrase that the Chinese Church of the future 'shall teach her members to agree to differ, but resolve to love.' Resolution (*b*) makes clear the position of the Conference and the function of the National Council. The principal points in it are as follows:

'We, the members of the Conference, joyfully confess our faith in, and renew our allegiance to, God the Father Almighty, Jesus Christ His Son our Lord and Saviour, who loved us and gave Himself for

our sins, and the Holy Spirit the Lord and Giver of Life: and acknowledge our loyalty to the Holy Scriptures as the supreme guide of faith and conduct and to the fundamental Christian beliefs held by the Churches to which we severally belong . . . The Conference . . . recognizes that the authority to determine what are the essential affirmations of the Christian faith lies with the several Churches of which those attending this Conference are members. Any National Christian Council which may be appointed by this Conference will not be in any sense a Church Council . . . It will be an advisory body which will seek to carry forward the work of this Conference and to bring the representatives of the different Churches and missions in China together in order that they may mutually enrich one another through common counsel, and will take action in matters of common interest only when it has reason to believe that the action taken will be in accordance with the wishes of the co-operating bodies.'

The resolution on the subject of industrial questions is worth quoting:

'In view of the importance of industrial problems and of the present state of public opinion in China, be it resolved that this Conference expresses its endorsement of the following standards for industrial labour:

(*a*) No employment of children under twelve years of age.
(*b*) One day's rest in seven.
(*c*) The safeguarding of the health of the workers, by limiting hours, by the improvement of sanitary conditions, by the installing of safety devices.

That this Conference directs the National Council to give these standards the widest publicity. And that this Conference calls upon Christian organisations throughout the country to endorse these standards and to take action to see that they are brought into force in China as soon as possible.'

I would venture to claim that, if the National Council fulfils its 'promise,' a Christian Church may be established in China which will be an example of unity of spirit to the world. And if it carries out its instructions in regard to industrial problems it will be a great factor in moulding the life of a united republic of China.

F. E. A. Shepherd.

Boone University, Wu Chang, China,

THE BRAHMO-SOMAJ AND CHRISTIANITY.

Sir,

After reading the article in the July issue on 'Christianity and the Religions of Asia,' I turned up a letter which I received in 1904 from Mr. Mozoomdar, a member of the Brahmo-Somaj, who believed himself to be as truly called by the Lord Jesus as was St. Paul. His book, *The Oriental Christ,* is in Dr. Williams' Library; I presented it to that institution after careful reading and frequent lending, so anyone who cares to read the account of his conversion and his exposition of the life of Jesus, as he understood it, can borrow it from this library.

He expressed to me in one of his letters his ardent desire to see the Kingdom of Christ triumphant in India. Of course he did not mean that he identified the Kingdom with any particular ecclesiastical organisation. In a letter written from the Himalayas, dated June 15th, 1904, he wrote

'Our central aim and aspiration is after the Spirit of God and Him alone. But, nevertheless, our relationship to His eternal Son is most tender and personal. We realize further that but for the revelation of the Father's nature as made by Christ Jesus, the image of God would be a blurred and fragmentary one! Here our agreement is perhaps complete. But what that revelation truly was is a matter in which we Easterns might claim a voice. Our old religious traditions and the trend of our whole spiritual culture point to unity with the Christ-Ideal which St. John the Evangelist set forth, as none before or after him has ever done.'

Mr. Mozoomdar has now passed out of our earthly limitations, and I have lost touch with the present members of the Brahmo-Somaj, and I do not know how far they resemble Mr. Mozoomdar in their fervent devotion to the Person and ideals of our Lord Jesus Christ.

If any one would care to borrow Mr. Mozoomdar's book, *The Spirit of God*, I shall be pleased to lend it on application, with 9*d.* to cover postage.

H. A. DALLAS.

INNISFAIL, CRAWLEY, SUSSEX.

DR. HARRIS'S *CREEDS OR NO CREEDS.*

SIR,

Having read Dr. Harris's *Creeds or No Creeds* in extenso, I am venturing to send you a few quotations and remarks:

> 'It is a great venture of faith, possible only by the help of grace, to believe that the Almighty Ruler of the Universe has humbled Himself to become man in the Person of Jesus of Nazareth, and to die upon the Cross' (p. 21).
>
> 'The idea of God *dwelling in* man (which is what is meant by Immanence) and that of God *becoming* man (which is what is meant by Incarnation) are radically distinct, and indeed contradictory' (p. 145).
>
> 'That the Awful and Omnipotent Creator of all things, King of the Ages . . . out of love for sinners should deign to take their nature upon Him, to work for years as a village carpenter' (p. 267).
>
> 'He (Jesus) Who on earth had lived as a mere village carpenter' (p. 280).
>
> 'In the Person of His Incarnate Son (*i.e.* in His own Person), He hungered, thirsted, &c.' (p. 341).
>
> '*God entire*—the whole substance of God—became man in the Person of His Eternal Son, and (as man) suffered and died for us' (p. 344, *cf.* p. 340).
>
> 'God is a *perfect society of persons* . . . each Person of the Trinity gives Himself wholly and unreservedly in love to each of the others, and loses Himself in order to find Himself again in the others' (p. 348).
>
> 'The Logos became incarnate as Jesus of Nazareth' (p. 366).

It seems to me that a plain man, comparing the above passages, would find it very difficult to derive an intelligible and consistent theology from them, while a theologian might suspect Dr. Harris of being a Patripassian, or an Apollinarian, or both. In his anxiety to avoid dividing the Substance he confounds the Persons, and then lapses into popular Tritheism. To prove the distinct Personality of the Spirit he gives six references to Acts (p. 40). In four of these we have 'The Holy Spirit said'; in 16^6, 'hindered by the Holy Spirit'; in 19^2, 'did ye receive Holy Spirit (no article)?'

The following are miscellaneous specimens of Dr. Harris's thought:

> 'If at first sight any of the circumstances of the post-Resurrection appearances (such as the handling and the eating) seem to imply that His body still consisted of natural flesh and blood, these must be understood to have been the result of a temporary accommodation to earthly conditions for evidential purposes' (p. 124).

Is there not a suggestion of pious fraud in this? I am reminded of Dummelow's comment on Luke 24^{26}, which I believe is quoted by Dr. Harris:

> 'Probably our Lord was in heaven during the Forty days, descending to earth for occasional interviews.'
>
> 'At the last Great Assize, He will not, like other men, stand before the judgment seat of God to be judged, but will Himself sit upon the tribunal, and assign to the whole human race, and to the evil spirits, their eternal recompense' (p. 219).

Dr. Harris does not tell us how long the Judgment Day will last.

> 'All the fundamental doctrines of science are based upon faith, not evidence' (p. 242). Scientific men, please note.
>
> 'When we see God face to face in heaven, and . . . drink of His essence' (p. 258).

I suppose there are people to whom such language is grateful and comforting. Is the essence 'whole and indivisible'?

> '"Flesh and blood," in their natural and unglorified condition, cannot inherit the Kingdom of God' (p. 274).

What is glorified blood like?

> 'The strange thing is that they (Modernists) do not perceive that, if the Incarnation is a fact, *the conception of Jesus, whether His mother was a virgin or not, was a divine miracle*' (p. 291).

I thought this was just what Modernists do perceive, and many Traditionalists do not.

At the end of the book Dr. Harris quotes:

> 'Two most distinguished scholars, Dr. Foakes-Jackson and Dr. Lake, who until recently were prominent in the Modernist movement, have now abandoned it, and have passed upon it strictures similar to my own, but much more severe' (p. 359).

The plain man is left to infer that they are now strong Traditionalists. Is this honest?

The Bishop of Lichfield, in his preface to the book, says: 'I hope that it will be widely read, and (seeing that the author is the last to fear criticism) acutely criticized. Its purpose is to find and to establish the Truth as it is in Jesus.' With what Dr. Harris says about disinterested love of truth (pp. 110—11) all Modernists will agree; and they will admire his piety, his learning, and his immense industry. Yet I cannot help feeling that he writes as an advocate, and not as a truth-seeker. And he deepens my melancholy conviction that between his mind and that of the average Modernist there is a great gulf fixed, which at present nothing can bridge. If this letter is not too long, I should like to add a few words from Canon Barnes's review in the *Church Family Newspaper*:

> 'English Modernism, though Dr. Harris does not realize the fact, is becoming constructive and it is showing that the Christian faith, when set in the framework made by modern knowledge, has all its old beauty and spiritual power, combined with an intellectual strength unsuspected by many of its critics.'

T. F. Royds, B.D.

A BOOK FOR PARENTS AND TEACHERS.

SIR,

I wish to commend to the notice of readers interested in the education of the young a book which appears to me to be of more than ordinary value in this connection: *The Mysteries of Life,* by Stanley De Brath, M.Inst.C.E., late Headmaster, Preston House Preparatory School, East Grinstead (Allen and Unwin, Ltd., 5/-).

Although written originally for the young and those who train them, its value and interest is by no means limited to these readers. The author combines a thoroughly modern outlook on nature, human life, and divine revelation, with a sane and reverent conservatism. In addition to a wide range of knowledge, he also possesses insight into the significance underlying phenomena, tradition, and history; appreciation of relative values is a marked feature of the book, the style is lucid and attractive. The volume covers such subjects as 'The Mystery of the Body,' 'Human Evolution,' 'The Mystery of Sex,' 'Revelation of God.' Under the latter heading the survey of the Bible is illuminating, and will be specially appreciated by modern Churchmen.

The subjects which require delicate handling are treated with admirable discretion; the tone of the whole is both rational and Christian.

If such teaching were given more widely youths would leave school with a more reasonable faith and a healthier moral sense.

H.A.D.

A REVISED CANON OF THE SCRIPTURES.

SIR,

Professor Adolf Harnack has, I believe, recently declared his opinion that it is time that the Old Testament should be cut out of the Canon. Few will follow the learned professor in such a course. But is it not time to consider the desirability of overhauling and revising the Canon as it has come down to us from early times? Much might be said for removing from the Old Testament Canon such books as Esther, Daniel and Canticles—to say nothing of some of the Psalms, portions of Judges and Joshua, and the Chronicles—and relegating them to the Apocrypha. Meanwhile, Maccabees I and the Wisdom books of the Apocrypha might have a place in the Old Testament collection. The New Testament, no doubt, stands on a different footing; but II Peter, beautiful as much of it is, could hardly be included in a revised Canon of the New Testament, and it seems probable that Jude should find its home in the revised and enlarged Apocrypha. The question, 'What is to be done with the Apocalypse'? is difficult to answer: its position in the Canon was long disputed.

One thing seems clear: if any revision were attempted, some effort should be made to put the various books of the Bible in an approximately correct chronological order. If the Pauline epistles were chronologically arranged, students would get a far surer understanding of Pauline thought in its vigorous development. It is very unsatisfactory, as things are, to find the two epistles to the Thessalonians printed after Romans and Corinthians; and equally so to find the Apocalypse at the close of the New Testament while the fourth Gospel remains where it now is.

E. B. H.

THE VIRGIN-BIRTH.

SIR,

In a recent lecture on the Incarnation first published in the *Church Times*, and afterwards in a small volume entitled *Foundations of Belief*, Canon Vernon Storr deals in a brief but striking manner with the story of the Virgin-birth. He removes or attempts to remove the burden of proving the truth of the story from those who believe it, and casts it on those who disbelieve it. 'If,' he says, 'the story is not true adequate evidence must be produced to show how the story arose.'

This is a bold challenge.

And he then asks the question, 'Whether the story could have arisen spontaneously in Jewish soil?' and answers it in the negative.

I venture to think that there was no time more likely than the latter half of the first century, and no place more likely than Palestine, for such a story to have arisen spontaneously.

We must bear in mind that at the time the story arose, the stupendous miracles of our Lord's bodily resurrection, and of his bodily ascension into Heaven had only recently taken place, and were believed by all members of the Christian Church to be literally true. It was a time of great religious excitement and tension. It would then not have been thought at all unreasonable to suppose that He who passed out of the world in this abnormal and miraculous manner should also have entered it in an abnormal and miraculous manner. At any rate, it would have been easier to think this of him than of any other person. This thought, if it existed, may have remained hidden in the mind for a long time before it was expressed, though it would be ready for expression as soon as the necessary stimulus was supplied.

It should also be remembered that in Jewish History stories of births which were miraculous or at least abnormal were not uncommon. It was recorded of Isaac, of Jacob and Esau, of Joseph, of Samson, of Samuel, and of John the Baptist that they were all born of mothers who were past the age of child-bearing, or were barren, and that their births were due to the intervention of angels of Jahweh, or took place as the result of the special intervention of Jahweh's answer to prayer.

Were the stories of these births absolutely and literally true or did they grow spontaneously on Jewish soil?

If the latter alternative be accepted, we have the clearest evidence of a tendency in Jewish thought to attribute to the births of prominent personages abnormal or miraculous incidents, so that at the time when the story of the virgin-birth was first published abroad there were hearers ready to accept it. They would receive the news with a bias in its favour rather than with impartial minds.

As to the circumstances in which the story was invented, if it were invented, it is impossible to dogmatise. It is not necessary to affirm that a sober-minded Jewish Christian learned in the law and the prophets deliberately constructed it out of his imagination and then published it abroad as true. On the contrary, it is easy to suppose that it arose quite spontaneously. A casual remark possibly misunderstood made in the presence of a few enthusiasts may have been the origin of a rumour which spread at first slowly but at length obtained general credence.

I do not claim to have solved the question of the origin of the story of the Virgin-Birth. I am not competent to discuss it in all its bearings, but I confidently submit that I have said enough to show that the story may have 'arisen spontaneously in Jewish soil.'

I will only add one remark. If it did so arise, it is unlikely that it arose during the life-time of Mary, as it could have been contradicted by her if it had not been true. This accounts for its late origin. On the other hand, if the story be true, I cannot understand why Mary did not made it known at an earlier date. It is said that she kept it secret from motives of delicacy. I wish some women of high character would express their fully-considered opinion on this point. They would be the best judges.

W. WHITWORTH.

18 Essex Villas,
Kensington, W.8.

[We believe Miss Maude Royden has done so publicly, but are unable to give the reference. Surely the supreme difficulty is to account for words and actions of the Virgin-Mother recorded in the Synoptic Gospels, which suggest not that she was keeping secret the fact of the miraculous birth, but that she was ignorant of it.—ED. *M.C.*]

SIR,

EMIGRANTS AND HONORARY CLERGY.

An article in the *Modern Churchman* for May drew attention to a clamant need when it pointed to the great numbers of emigrants from our shores to the Dominions, and to the small provision for preventing their loss of all organised religious life. It proposed a bold policy to meet the need, *viz.* the ordaining the most suitable among them to be voluntary clergy, who might carry on their secular occupations as emigrants while securing, as far as opportunity goes, the religious needs of those around them in their new homes. Such a proposal deserves consideration, but many may feel that the more it is considered the more serious the objections to it become. I do not intend to enter upon these, but rather to ask if better results might not be gained by simpler and less revolutionary means. I propose two reforms; one an old proposal, the other a new one, neither of which would be sufficient alone, though each in itself would be valuable and would serve many purposes. They would supplement one another, and taken together might go far to meet the need of emigrants, and a good many other needs felt in the Church besides.

1. The Diaconate provides for a life in Orders which admits at the same time of civil occupation and spiritual service; and its abeyance, save as a stepping stone to Priesthood, is a loss of many opportunities. Its revival as a permanent status might turn these to account. A number of permanent Deacons sent out among the thousands emigrating, would go far to meet their need, while other pressing needs would also be met by the revival of the Diaconate for men to whom the Priesthood is not an end in view, and to whom it should not be opened. The union of small parishes in the country, and the better service of poor parishes in towns, would often become practicable, where this is not so now, if two or three permanent Deacons served under the direction of one responsible incumbent in full Orders, while supporting themselves, and giving only a part of their time to religious duties. And in this way scope for very valuable service might be given to many men whose education or mental qualifications are inadequate for, or whose ties and obligations preclude them from, full Orders and the entire consecration of their lives.

2. But this alone would not provide what is needed. There must be coupled with it a second reform which quite independently is much to be desired. And the second might also help our emigrants, while it would help in many ways beside. This consists of Bishops giving commission limited alike in time and place, to men found fit to undertake some service

under particular conditions only. Ordination confers a commission which is permanent and universal: what is wanted is that side by side with this there should be a commission which is strictly *ad hoc* and terminable.

An important example of the great value such a restricted commission might have is to be seen in Confirmation. At present this is a burden too great for many Bishops to bear, and Bishops Suffragan or Bishops Coadjutant are costly and unsatisfactory expedients for getting over the difficulty. The Bishop who tries to do his duty without them finds fatigue and staleness result inevitably from continual confirming, which seriously lessen the value of his service. His time for other duties becomes insufficient, and those confirmed receive less help than they might. But in every Diocese there are a score or two of the Clergy who, if commissioned to do so, might administer confirmation, each in a few assigned centres for the current season on the Bishop's behalf; and being personally fitted for such service they would render it with great advantage to the laity concerned, to the Bishop, and it may be added to themselves, since it does a man good to call his latent powers into use. The administration of Confirmation by the Priesthood has long since been the practice in the Eastern Church, and that of Baptism by Priests and others is everywhere admitted. Yet Baptism is undoubtedly the greater moment than Confirmation which is the seal set to complete it; and at one time Baptism was usually undertaken by the Bishop. There is therefore no room for objection on the ground of order; and the magnitude of the benefit that might result should over-ride mere habit.

Similar commissions *ad hoc* might well be given, where there is occasion, by Bishops to permanent Deacons, to celebrate the other sacrament. In some sparsely populated region of an outlying Dominion such a Deacon working his own land might gather around him at intervals Christian people beyond the reach of a Priest for the time being, and be authorised to act then and there as the Bishop's Commissary in consecrating and administering the Holy Communion. This sacrament is the act of the Church; and it would be just as much by the authority of the Church mediated through the Bishop if his commission were a restricted one given to a Deacon for particular purpose as it is when a general one is given in conferring Priests' Orders. Of course the consent of the Church would be given in the initiation of such a reform of practice; and no Bishop would be entitled to give *ad hoc* commission except for service within his Diocese and during the time in which he himself maintained it. Here again there might be found good occasion for such action in small grouped parishes, or in large under-staffed ones at home.

There is plenty of precedent for Episcopal Commission, *ad hoc* only, in a number of other directions; *e.g.* in the matter of institutions and inductions, in the appointment of Surrogates for the issue of marriage licences, and in the consecration of churches and churchyards, not to mention the varied duties of Bishops Suffragan, who, in spite of their Episcopal Order, depend on special commission from their Diocesan. The reform here asked for would therefore be no more than an extension of existing usage in fresh directions. And so many facts of experience suggest that a bold extension of such *ad hoc* commission by Episcopal authority to suitable men, for service beyond their ordinary range, whether as Deacons or Priests, might prove of the greatest value to the religious life of the Church, that perhaps the *Modern Churchman* may be able to secure wide consideration for it.

E. P. Boys-Smith.

Hordle Vicarage,
Brockenhurst.